

❖ HEBRAICA. ❖

VOL. IV.

APRIL, 1888.

No. 3.

THE HEBREW PENTAMETER.

BY PROF. C. A. BRIGGS, D. D.,

Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

The Hebrew pentameter is measured by five beats of the rhythmical accent. The caesura usually comes after the third beat; but not infrequently after the second, so as to give a variation to the movement. The greater portion of Hebrew poetry is in the trimeter movement, the greater portion of the remainder is pentameter. The tetrameters and hexameters are less numerous.

The pentameter line is often treated as if it was composed of two lines in parallelism. But the second half of the pentameter line is not in such marked parallelism with the first as the second line of a trimeter poem. It is rather supplementary to the first half, even when parallelism appears.

1) The first specimen of the pentameter that we shall give is the alphabetical dirge contained in Lamentations III. This dirge has twenty-two strophes in which the initial letter of the strophe begins with a letter of the Hebrew alphabet in the order from א to ת. But the alphabetical structure is not confined to the initial letters of the strophes. Each strophe contains three lines and each line begins with the characteristic letter of the strophe. We shall give four of these strophes as specimens of the twenty-two. Bickell makes these lines of twelve syllables in accordance with his theory of the structure of Hebrew verse. In general, his lines of twelve syllables correspond with our pentameter.

א

אני-הגבר ראה עני | בשבט עברתו
אותי נהג | וילך חשך ולא-אור
אך-בי ישב יהפך | ידו כל-היום

ב

בלה בשרי ועורי | שבר עצמותי
בנה עלי | ויקף ראש ותלאה
במחשבים חושיבני | כמתי עולם

ג

גדר בערי ולא-אצא | הכביר נחשתי
גם-כי אזעק ואשוע | שתם תפלתי
גדר דרכי בגזית | נתיבותי עזה

ד

דב ארב הוא-לי | אריה במסתרים
דרכי סורר ויפשחני | שמני שומם
דרך קשתו | ויציבני כמטרא לחץ

The only changes in the Massoretic text are insertions of Maqqeph between **הוא-לי** (line 8); **גם-כי** (line 8); **לא-אצא** (line 7); **אך-בי** (line 3); **אני-הגבר** (line 10), all of which changes are in accordance with good usage. The lines have the caesura after the third beat of the accent, except in lines 2 and 6; the latter being the only tetrameter line among the twelve. We have seen that there are occasional dimeter lines among the trimeters, and trimeter lines among the tetrameters; so we are not surprised to find a tetrameter among these pentameters.

It will be seen that the parallelism is between the pentameter lines rather than between the two parts of the pentameters; the second half of the pentameter gives a supplementary statement. In some cases this is akin to parallelism, as in lines 4 and 9; but it is noteworthy that in the latter the verb is omitted, showing its dependence upon the first half of the line, and in the former it is really complementary, in that the treatment of the bones is added to the flesh and skin.

2) The second specimen that we shall give is two strophes of the great alphabetical poem in praise of the Divine Word, Psalm cxix. We have here twenty-two strophes, and each strophe is composed of 8 lines, and each line of the strophe begins with the characteristic letter of the strophe. The pentameter movement is clear, and the lines are distinctly marked off by the letters of the alphabet. Bickell also regards the lines of this poem as composed of twelve syllables.

א

אשרי תמימי-דרך | ההלכים בתורת יהוה
אשרי נצרי עדתיו | בכל-לב ידרשוהו
אף לא-פעלו עולה | בדרכיו הלכו

אתה צויתָה פקדיך | לשמר מאד
 אחלי יכנו דרכי | לשמר חקיך
 אז לא-אבוש | בהביטי אל-כל מצותיך
 אורך בִּישֶׁר-לבב | בלמדי משפטי צדקך
 את-חקיך אשמר | אל תעזבני ער-מאד

ב

במה יזכה-נער את-ארחו | לשמר בדברך
 בכל-לבי דרשתיך | אל תשגני ממצותיך
 בלבי צפנתי אמרתך | למען לא-אחטא-לך
 ברוך אתה יהוה | למדני חקיך
 בשפתי ספרתי | כל משפטי פיך
 בדרך ערותיך ששתי | כעל כל-הון
 בפקודיך אשיחה | ואביטה ארחתיך
 בחקתיך אשתעשע | לא אשכח דברך

We remove the Maqqeph in א, line 6, between אל-כל and מצותך, which has made it a very long word of six syllables; between אל and תעזבני in א, line 8; between אל and תשגני in ב, line 2, and between משפטי and פיך in ב, line 5. We insert Maqqeph between בִּישֶׁר-לבב in א, line 7, and לא-אחטא-לך in ב, line 3, in both cases having no more than five syllables. There is but a single tetrameter line in the sixteen, namely, in ב, line 7.

3) We shall now give a pentameter prayer with a refrain. This prayer is given in Jonah II. It has two strophes of six lines each; closing with אל-היכל קדשך, and a broken strophe of three lines without a refrain. It seems that the author of Jonah used an older poem, or so much of it as suited his purpose, leaving the third strophe unfinished.

I.

קראתי מצרה-לי | אל יהוה ויענני
 מבטן שאול שועתי | שמעת קולי
 ותשליכני מצולה בלבב-ימים | ונהר יסבבני
 כל משבריך וגליך | עלי עברו
 ואני אמרתי | נגרשתי מנגד עיניך
 אך אוסיף להביט | אל-היכל קדשך

II.

אפפוני מים ער-נפש | תהום יסבבני
 סוף חבוש לראשי | לקצבי הרים
 ירדתי הארץ | ברחיה בערי לעולם

ותעל משחת חיי | יהוה אלהי
בהתעטף עלי נפשי | את-יהוה זכרתי
ותבוא אליך תפלתי | אל-היכל קדשך

III.

משמרים הבלי שוא | חסדם יעזבו
ואני בקול תורה | אזכחה לך
אשר נדרתי אשלמה | ישועתה ליהוה

There are three pentameter distichs, the first distich has synonymous parallelisms, the second progressive parallelisms, and the third antithetical parallelism. The caesura is usually after the third beat, but in the fifth line it is after the second beat.

In the second strophe the Massorites made an unfortunate separation of verses 6 and 7. לקצרי הרים goes with the previous line as its complement, making the first distich of this strophe synonymous. The second distich then begins with ירדתי and is antithetical, the second line begins with ותעל. The closing distich is synonymous.

With this change we have again a symmetrical strophe of six pentameter lines exactly like its mate with the refrain. We have found no occasion to change the Massoretic Maqqeph's thus far in this piece. But in the fragment of the third strophe we remove the Maqqeph's between הובלי and שוא (line 1) and between אזכחה and לך. The latter must be removed on account of the caesura, which is immediately before the verb; the former might remain and give us a tetrameter line.

4) The Pilgrim Psalms CXX.-CXXXIV. are all pentameters, with the single exception of the long CXXXII., which is a trimeter that in other respects seems out of place in this little collection. They are fine specimens of pentameters, and the study of the poetical structure aids in the interpretation.

We have seen that Bickell's lines of twelve syllables correspond in general with our pentameters. It is interesting to note that he makes all these Pilgrim Psalms, except CXXXII., of the measure of seven and five, that is, seven syllables in the first line, five in the second, seven in the third and five in the fourth, and so on. The only difference from his metre of twelve syllables is in breaking the line in two; there is no difference in the sum total of syllables. In this Bickell is mistaken, the poems are really the same in their structure as those already considered.

Psalm CXX.

אל-יהוה בצרתה לי | קראתי ויענני
יהוה הצילה נפשי | משפת-שקר מלשון-רמיה
מה-יתן לך | ומה-יסיף לך לשון-רמיה

חצי גבור שנונים | עם-גחלי רתמים
 אויה-לי כי-גרתִי משך | שכנתי עם-אהלי-קדר
 רבת שכנה-לה נפשי | עם-שונא שלום
 אני שלום | וכי-ארבר המה למלחמה

This Psalm gives eight pentameter lines. We notice one of the features of the Pilgrim Psalm, the repetition of certain catch-words, e. g., מלשון רמיה, שכן, and שלום making a sort of marching rhythm.

Psalm CXXI.

אשא עיני אל-ההרים | מאין-יבא עזרי
 עזרי מעם-יהוה | עשה שמים וארץ
 אל-יתן למוט רגלך | אל-ינום שמרך
 הנה לא-ינום ולא-ישן | שומר ישראל
 יהוה שמרך | יהוה צלך על-ירימינך
 יומם השמש לא-יכבה | וירח בלילה
 יהוה ישמרך מכל-רע | ישמר את-נפשך
 יהוה ישמר-צאתך ובואך | מעתה ועד-עולם

These eight lines are pentameters. They carry the marching rhythm further than the previous psalm. עזרי of the first line reappears in the second, making this synonymous distich complete in itself. The ינום of line 3 is taken up in line 4, and the שמר of line 4 appears in line 5 and becomes the catch-word of the rest of the poem, in lines 7 and 8. It is possible that יהוה of the last line arose by the copyist's eye catching the first word of the upper line. But the Mas-sorites insert a Maqqeph between ישמר-צאתך and there is no reason, from the rhythm, why it should be omitted.

Psalm CXXII.

שמחתי באמרים לי | בית-יהוה נלך
 עמדות היו רגלינו | בשעריך ירושלם
 ירושלם הבנויה | כעיר שחברה-לה יחדו
 ששם עלו שבטים | שבטי יה
 עדות לישראל | להודות לשם יהוה
 כי-שמה כסאות למשפט | כסאות לבית-דוד
 שאלו שלום יררשלם | ישליו אהביך
 יהי שלום בחילך | שלוה בארמנותיך
 למען-אחי ורעי | אדברה-נא שלום בך
 למען בית-יהוה אלהינו | אבקשה טוב-לך

This poem of ten lines is composed throughout of pentameter lines. Only one emendation is necessary. We agree with Bickell in removing יִשְׁבוּ from line 6 before כִּסְאוֹת. It has come in from the margin, or the mind of the scribe. The line is sufficiently clear without it, and it disturbs the rhythm. We notice the catch-words יְרוּשָׁלַם and שְׁלוֹם.

Psalm CXXIII.

אֵלֶיךָ נִשְׁאַתִּי אֶת-עֵינִי | הִישְׁבִּי בַשָּׁמַיִם
הִנֵּה כְּעֵינִי עֹבְדִים | אֶל-יָד אֲרוֹנֵיהֶם
כְּעֵינִי שֹׁפְחָה | אֶל-יָד גְּבֻרָתָהּ
כֶּן-עֵינֵינוּ | אֶל-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ | עַד שִׁיחַנְנוּ
חֲנָנוּ חֲנָנוּ | כִּי-רַב שְׁבַעְנוּ בּוֹ
רַבַּת שְׁבַעָה לָּהּ | נִפְשָׁנוּ הִלְעָג
לְעַג הַשְּׂאֲנָנִים | הִבּוֹ לִגְאִי יוֹנָם

The first and second lines are evidently pentameters. The third line is a tetrameter as it stands. It is probable that הִנֵּה has been rubbed off at the beginning. The fourth line is a pentameter. כֶּן should be combined with עֵינֵינוּ by a Maqqeph. This gives us a synonymous tetrastich. In the fifth line the Massoretic יְהוָה has slipped in, as often elsewhere in Hebrew literature; we strike it out therefore. The last verse is difficult. The קָרִי very properly reads לִגְאִי יוֹנָם which gives us a pentameter for the last line, but leaves us with a trimeter in the previous line. הִלְעָג is not good grammar before הַשְּׂאֲנָנִים. It seems likely that a second לְעַג, a proper construct without the article was originally there, and that it was omitted by a copyist's mistake. The omission of repeated words is as common in copying as the repetition of words by mistake. If we restore it, we remove the fault of grammar, give the verb an object in the same line; make it a pentameter line like all the others in the poem, and give another example of the repetition of a catch-word. The marching rhythm then comes complete and is carried on from the beginning to the end, in לְעַג, חֲנָנוּ, שְׁבַע, חֲנָנוּ, עֵינִים. The closing tristich is a fine example of progressive parallelism, in which the first half of the second line is synonymous with the last half of the first, and the second half is progressive thereto. The first half of the third line is synonymous with the second half of the second line, and the second half of the third line is synonymous with the second half of the first line. We have not space for all of the Pilgrim Psalms, and accordingly will select a few others.

Psalm CXXV.

הַבִּטְחִים בִּיהוָה | כְּהָר צִיּוֹן לֹא-יִמוּט
לְשׁוֹלֵם יֹשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלַם | הָרִים סְבִיב-לָהּ

ויהוה סביב לעמו | מעתה ועד-עולם
 כי-לא-ינוח שבט הרשע | על-גורל הצדיקים
 למען לא-ישלחו הצדיקים | בעולתה ידיהם
 הטיבה יהוה לטובים | ולישרים בלבותם
 והמטים עקלקלותם | יוליכם יהוה את-פעלי-האון
 שלום על ישראל

The Massorites have divided verses 1 and 2 unfortunately. **לעולם ישב** goes with **ירושלם**, and thus we have a fine specimen of introverted parallelism with the third line, in which the first half of the second line is synonymous with the second half of the third, as the second half of the first line with the first half of the third, and the three lines make a tristich. We next have a progressive distich, which is followed by an antithetical distich and a trimeter refrain.

Psalm CXXVI.

בשוב יהוה את-שבית-ציון | היינו כחלמים
 אזימלא שחוק פינו | ולשוננו רנה
 אזיאמרו בגוים | הגדיל לעשות עם-אלה
 הגדיל לעשות עמנו | היינו שמחים
 שובה יהוה את-שביתנו | כאפיקים בנגב
 הזרעים ברמעה | ברנה יקצרו
 הלוך ילך ובכה | נשא משך-הזרע
 בא יבא ברנה | נשא אלמתיו

The divine name **יהוה**, by scribal error, appears in the Massoretic text of lines 3 and 4 with **הגדיל**, where it was unnecessary, as the subject of the verb is clear from the context. We have stricken it out. We also follow the **קרי** in line 5, reading **שביתנו**. We correct the scribal blunder of line 1, and read **שבית** for the **שיבת** which has arisen by transposition of the letters **י** and **ב**. The changes of the Maqqeph can hardly be objected to with propriety. They are made to accord with good usage. The removal of a Massoretic Maqqeph between **בא** and **יבא** in the last line makes it more harmonious with **הלך ילך** of the previous line. This Psalm is composed of two tetrastichs; they are both of great beauty. The first is an example of introverted parallelism. The first and fourth lines are synonymous throughout. The second line is synonymous with the last half of the first and fourth lines; and the third line is synonymous with the first half of these lines. The second tetrastich is entirely different in structure. The second line is progressive to the first; and is of the tetrameter movement in order to bring out a strong antithesis between its two equal members.

This antithesis then expands in the antithetical lines that follow, where the third line is synonymous with the first half of the second, and the fourth line with its second half.

Psalm CXXX.

ממעמקים קראתיך | אדני שמעה בקולי
 תהינה אזניך קשבות | לקול תחנוני
 אם-עונות תשמר-יה | אדני מי יעמד
 כי עמך הסליחה | למען תורא
 קייתי יהוה | קותה נפשי ולדברו
 הוחלתי נפשי לאדני | משמרים לבקר
 שמרים לבקר | יחל ישראל אל-יהוה
 כי-עם-יהוה החסד | והרבה עמו פדות
 והוא יפדה את-ישראל | מכל עונותיו

The Massoretic text obscures the movement in several places. יהוה slipped into the first line and was the occasion of an incorrect division of the verses. We agree with Bickell and strike it out. Then we have a distich of pentameters in which there is introverted parallelism between the halves of the lines. The second distich is antithetical. In the three lines that follow, the Massoretic accentuation and verse divisions destroy the poetry altogether. We therefore discard them and follow the LXX., and thereby gain not only the pentameter but also a better parallelism. As the first line begins with קייתי, the sixth line begins with its synonymous הוחלתי. The transition from the first person of the verb to נפשי is in accordance with the change from קולי to אקוא in Psalm III. 5. We have, moreover, another parallelism between לדברו and לאדני making the first half of the sixth line synonymous with the second half of the fifth line. The seventh line begins with שמרים לבקר, which is another example of the marching movement so common in these Psalms, and it results in another case of introverted parallelism between these two lines. These three lines are accordingly bound together in synonymous parallelism. The eighth line is now synonymous with the fourth, and the ninth line is in strong antithesis with the third; so that our Psalm is really composed of an opening distich of prayer for redemption; and a concluding heptastich of great beauty setting forth the assurance of the redemption of Israel.

5) We shall now give the dirge of Babylon (Isa. XLVII), which is one of the finest pieces in the Old Testament.

I.

ררי ושבי על-עפר | בתולת בת-בבל
 שבי לארץ אין-כסא | בת כשרים

כִּי־לֹא תוֹסִיפִי יִקְרְאוּ־לְךָ | רַכָּה וְעִנְיָה
 קַח־י רַחִים וְטַחֲנִי־קִמַּח | גְּלִי צִמְתָּךְ
 חֲשָׁפִי שְׁבֵל גְּלִי־שׁוֹק | עֲבֵרִי נִהְרֹת
 תִּגַּל עֲרוֹתְךָ | גַּם תִּרְאֶה הִרְפַּתְךָ
 נִקֵּם אִקָּח | וְלֹא אִפְגַּע אֶדָם

This strophe is composed of a tristich of two synonymous lines with third progressive thereto; and a tetrastich of three synonymous lines with the fourth progressive to it. Lines 3 and 4 might be taken as three tetrastichs, but they are better as we have given them, the first of them referring to bondage, the second to exile.

II.

שְׁבִי דוֹמֶם וּבְאִי־בַחֲשֶׁךְ | בֵּת כְּשָׁדִים
 כִּי־לֹא תוֹסִיפִי יִקְרְאוּ־לְךָ | גְּבֵרֶת מַמְלָכוֹת
 קִצְפָּתִי עַל עַמִּי | חִלְלָתִי נִחְלָתִי
 וְאַתָּנָם בִּידֶךָ | לֹא־שִׁמַּת לָהֶם רַחֲמִים
 עַל זֶקֶן הַכְּבֵדָת | עַל־ךָ מֵאֵד
 וְתֹאמְרִי לַעֲוֹלָם אֲהִיָּה | גְּבֵרֶת עַד
 לֹא־שִׁמַּת אֱלֹה עַל־לִבְךָ | לֹא־זָכַרְתָּ אַחֲרִיתָהּ

I agree with Eichhorn and Cheyne that the line גָּאֲלֵנוּ יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת שְׁמוֹ has come in from the margin as a scribal exclamation of praise. It disturbs the thought of the piece as well as the structure of the strophe. I also agree with Cheyne in separating עַד from שִׁמַּת, where it gives no good sense, and in attaching it to גְּבֵרֶת in line 6.

This strophe begins with an imperative, and its first and second lines resemble the second and third lines of the previous strophe, so that we have a progressive distich. A progressive tristich takes up the middle of the strophe, and it concludes with a synonymous distich.

III.

וְעַתָּה שְׁמַע־זֹאת עֲרִינָה | הִישַׁבְתָּ לְבַטָּח
 הָאִמְרָה בִּלְבָבָהּ | אֲנִי וְאִפְסִי עוֹד
 לֹא־אִשָּׁב אֶלְמִנָּה | וְלֹא אֶדַּע שְׁכֹל
 וְתִבְאֲנָה לְךָ שְׁתֵּי־אֱלֹהִים | רִגַּע בְּיוֹם אֶחָד
 שְׁכֹל וְאֶלְמָן | כְּתָמָם בָּאוּ עֲלֶיךָ
 בְּרַב כְּשָׁפִיךְ | בַּעֲצַמַת הַבְּרִיךְ מֵאֵד
 וְתִבְטַח־י בְּרַעַתְךָ | אִמְרַת אֵין רֹאנִי

NB
This strophe also begins with an imperative, and הישבת לבטח corresponds with כת-בכל and בת בשרים of the previous strophes, לבטח of the first line reappears in ותבטחי of the last line. The strophe is a heptastich in which there is a sort of introverted parallelism about the fourth line as a centre.

IV.

דעי' חכמתך ודעתך | היא שובכתך
ותאמרי בלבך | אני ואפסי עור
ובא עליך רעה | לא-תדעי שחרה
ותפל עליך הוה | לא-תוכלי כפרה
ותבא עליך פתאם | שאה לא-תדעי
עמדי-נא בחברך וברב-כשפיך | באשר-יגעת מנעוריך
אולי תוכלי הועיל | נלאית ברב-עצתיך

NB
We insert דעי' at the beginning in accordance with the LXX. and the usage of the poet to begin each strophe with an imperative or jussive. We follow the LXX. and Arabic Versions, and omit the Massoretic אולי תערוצי from the last line. The sixth line is quite long. It is possible that ברב כשפיך is a marginal insertion from line 6 of the previous strophe, with which it is parallel. The opening distich of this strophe corresponds with that of the previous strophe, the second line being the same with the exception of the substitution of ך with Imperfect for the Participle with the article, and the first lines are synonymous. We next have a synonymous tristich which corresponds with lines 4 and 5 of the previous strophe. The strophe ends with a synonymous distich which also corresponds with the last distich of the previous strophe. The entire strophe is accordingly synonymous with the previous strophe.

V.

יעמדו-נא ויושיעך | הברי-שמים החזים כוכבים
מוריעים לחדשים | מאשר יבאו עליך
הנה היו כקש | אש שרפתם
ולא יצילו את-נפשם | מיד להבה
אין-גחלת לחמם | אור לשבת נגרו
כן-היו-לך אשר יגעת | סחרך מנעוריך
איש לעברו תעו | אין מושיעך

NB
This strophe begins with a jussive on account of its reference to the magicians. The ויושיעך of the first line is the catch-word of the strophe that reappears in אין מושיעך of the last line. The strophe as a whole is progress-

ive to the previous pair of strophes. The opening distich has synonymous parallelism between the second member of the first line and the first member of the second, but the second member of the second line is progressive to the first member of the first line. The middle of the strophe is a synonymous tristich. The strophe comes to an end with a progressive distich.

We have selected the above specimens of the pentameter, not only to show the pentameter movement where it is evident in the alphabetical poems, but also in order to show the help the study of poetry gives to the criticism of the text, and so an understanding of the parallelism upon which the interpretation depends.

Our next paper will treat of the Hebrew Hexameter.

THE TARGUM TO JEREMIAH.

BY PROF. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, D. D.,

Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio.

It may be taken as generally conceded that the Targums, although based substantially on the Massoretic text, yet occasionally show traces of variation. The amount and value of such variation has not yet been definitely settled however, and, in investigating the text of Jeremiah, I have been led to look into the Targum. The results are embodied in this paper.

I have used for comparison the Hebrew text of Jablonsky (Berlin, 1699), mainly, because my copy has a wide margin, convenient for notes. Wherever this paper speaks of M.T. (=Massoretic text) this edition is meant. As this edition has a good reputation for correctness, it may be taken as fairly representative of the accepted Hebrew.

The text of the Targum is notoriously in a bad condition, and the means of correcting it are inaccessible in this country. The printed copies may be arranged in three classes—that of Bomberg repeated in Buxtorf,¹ (b) that of the Antwerp and Paris polyglotts (a), and that of Lagarde,² Codex Reuchlinianus, (r), the oldest known manuscript, at least the oldest that can be dated with certainty. These three have been collated by Cornill in the *Zeitschrift fuer die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1887, pp. 178 sqq. I have relied upon this collation in comparing the Targum with the Hebrew.

The Targum to Jeremiah presents the characteristics of the other Targums. A considerable portion of it may be called a close translation. In many cases, however, it expands by the insertion of words or phrases. In others, it paraphrases or interprets. Instead of figurative expressions, it sometimes gives their direct meaning as understood by the translator. Especially where the Hebrew is obscure it is apt to give a paraphrase, and in these passages it is sometimes difficult to make out the text which the translator had before him. An example or two will illustrate these features. The very first verse of the book will serve. The Hebrew has "The words of Jeremiah, son of Hilkiah, of the priests who were in Anathoth in the land of Benjamin." The Targum renders "The words of prophecy of Jeremiah, son of Hilkiah, of the chiefs of the priests of the prefects that were in Jerusalem, the man who had received his inheritance in the land of Anathoth, in the land of the tribe of Benjamin." I have italicized the additions which

¹ According to Cornill (*Ezekiel* p. 112) Walton's polyglott has Buxtorf's text with the Antwerp translation, "adapted" in places.

² *Prophetæ Chaldaicæ*. Paulus Lagarde e fide codicis reuchliniani edidit. Lipsiæ, 1872.

are here quite extensive. It would seem at first sight that a translator who allows himself such liberties could not be relied upon at all. After a little, we see however, that the additions are generally limited to certain cases that can be easily distinguished. The names Judah, Benjamin, etc., are generally preceded by the word *tribe*, as though it were the translator's habit to speak of them in this way. The desire to avoid anthropomorphisms will account for a large number of cases. The *Word of Jehovah* is expanded into *the Word of prophecy from before the Lord*. Where God himself speaks in the first person the Targum substitutes *My Word* (מימרי). In i. 8, Jeremiah says "Jehovah put forth his hand and touched my mouth," the Targum renders "The Lord sent forth the words of his prophecy and arranged [them] in my mouth." Jeremiah's strong expression (addressed to God) "thou hast surely deceived this people" (iv. 10) is softened into "false prophets are deceiving this people." So where the prophet (under the influence of strong emotion, no doubt) says (xiv. 8, 9), "Why shouldst thou be like a stranger in the land, and like a traveler who turns aside to lodge? why shouldst thou be like a man taken by surprise, like a strong man not able to save?" the Targum gives us "Why should thy wrath descend upon us and *we* be like sojourners in the land and like a traveler that turneth aside to lodge? why should thy wrath descend upon us and *we* be driven about and forsaken when thou art a strong man able to save?" As an example of interpretation in translating, we may notice i. 11. The prophet sees an *almond rod* according to Hebrew. In the Targum he sees a *king watching to do evil*. For a *boiling pot with its face to the North* is put a *king raging like a pot and his army marshalled and coming from the face of the North*. In ii. 1, *thy coming after me in the wilderness* is rendered or paraphrased—that *they believed in my word and came after my two messengers after Moses and Aaron in the wilderness for forty years*. The priests are not allowed to say (ii. 7) "where is Jehovah," but—*let us fear before the Lord*. The *lions* of the Hebrew (ii. 15) become *kings* in the translation. One curious case is where Ebed-Melech, the Cushite, is translated "a servant of King Zedekiah," as though Zedekiah were called the Cushite in derision. These examples, which might be multiplied tenfold without difficulty, will suffice to show the method of the translator. The immediate question is, whether, in spite of the difficulties arising from the method, the Targum is of any real help to us in throwing light upon the Hebrew. In order to answer this question, we must leave out of view all these eccentricities of interpretation and consider only those cases which seem to indicate a various reading. Strictly speaking a variant exists only where the consonantal text is affected. We suppose the Targumist not to have been acquainted with the Massoretic vowel points. In a few cases he pronounced a word differently from what the punctuators indicate. These variants (in a minor sense) may at least be mentioned. We read in vi. 2 "*I have destroyed the daughter of Zion*." The Targum renders רמית קלקלת, apparently taking it as a second person feminine = רמית.

The fuller form (with yodh) is found elsewhere in Jeremiah. In II. 13, יְכֹלִי is translated as though it were יְכֹלִי (so LXX.); XVIII. 17 for אֲרָאם Targum and LXX. read אֲרָאם; XXIII. 26 נְבִיאִי is translated מַתְנֵבֶן (= נְבִיאִי). This is to be sure a variation in the consonants, but the omission or insertion of a vowel letter is extremely common. In XXX. 13 the noun תַּעֲלָה is translated as though it were תַּעֲלָה; XXXVI. 15, שֶׁב of the Hebrew becomes שֶׁב; LI. 17 "for a lie is *his image*," the Targum has "for a lie *have they cast*"—נִסְכּוֹ for נִסְכּוֹ.

The real variants may be divided into two classes: those in which the Targum agrees with the LXX. and those in which the Targum has not this support. Readings of the former class have a strong probability in their favor owing to the independent nature of their testimony. If I have correctly observed the facts, the Targum and the LXX. agree together as against the M.T. in the following instances: III. 18, "which I made *your fathers inherit*": *their fathers*.¹ IV. 3, "for thus saith Jehovah to the men of Judah and to *Jerusalem*": to the *inhabitants* of Jerusalem. IV. 8, "heat of the wrath of Jehovah": omit *of the wrath*. IV. 26, "from before his wrath": *and from before*. VII. 27, "all these words": omit *all*. IX. 6, "for what shall I do on account of the daughter of my people": on account *of the evil* of the daughter of my people. XI. 19, "let us destroy the tree": *saying come and let us destroy*.² XVII. 13, "and ye shall serve there other gods day and night because I will not show you mercy"—אִשֶּׁר לֹא אֶתֵּן לָכֶם חַנּוּנִי. The LXX. has οὐδὲ δώσωσιν ὑμῖν ἐλεος, the Targum דְּלֹא יְהִי לָכֶן רַחֲמִין. The former points to יִתְּנוּ; of the latter I am not quite certain, though it certainly is not the natural translation of the M.T. We can account for the change from יִתְּנוּ on dogmatic reasons (it seemed to recognize the real existence of other gods),³ and perhaps the same reasons would lead the Targum to make its rendering indefinite. [I, Jehovah] "try the reins and to give" (XVII. 15): omit *and*. "Jehovah hath saved *thy* people" (XXXI.): *his* people. "And they turned to me back and not face *and to teach* [וְלִמֵּד] them rising early and teaching (XXXII. 33) [וְלִמֵּד]: LXX. has καὶ ἐδίδαξα (= and I taught them). Targum וְשִׁלַּחִית לִוְתָּהוּ יֵת כָּל עֲבָדֵי נְבִיאָא which evidently points to the same reading, though so long a paraphrase. וְאֵלֶמֶד is the original of both and is exactly the form needed. It may have been corrupted by the following וְלִמֵּד. XXXIV. 5, "*and* 'alas Lord' shall they mourn for him": omit *and*. XXXV. 17, "Jehovah *God of Hosts*": Jehovah of Hosts. As I pointed out recently, interpolations of this kind are very frequent.⁴ "All the *former* words which were upon

¹ I put the Massoretic reading first, then, after a colon, that in which the two versions agree.

² In this case the insertion of the word *saying* is almost necessary to the sense of a translation. It is possible, therefore, that both versions put it in without authority from their text.

³ I owe this observation to Professor Stade.

⁴ Even here the testimony of the Targums is not homogeneous, nor is that of the LXX. But on the principle that the versions are more likely to be corrected into conformity with the M.T. than to be changed away from it we may assume the discrepant MSS. to preserve the original especially when two (one from each version) agree.

the former roll (xxxvi. 28): omit the italicized word. To Jeremiah, *the prophet* (xxxvii. 6): omit *the prophet*. This again is a case of frequent occurrence, and although only one edition of the Targum has the shorter text, its concurrence with the LXX. is significant. In xl. 5, the translators seem not to have had our present text before them, and agree in substituting **אם לא** for **עודנו לא** (LXX. *εἰ δὲ μὴ*, Tar. **ואם לית**). “And Johanan and Jonathan, sons of Kareah” (xl. 8): and Johanan, son of Kareah. xli. 10, “the daughters of the king”: insert *and*. xlii. 22, “with famine”: *and* with famine. L. 11 insert **ו** before the second **כי**. L. 29, both versions agree with the Q^ri in inserting **לה**.

If any reader will look at these passages in his Hebrew Bible I am sure he will find the internal evidence in their favor in every case unless it be the one already noted, xi. 19. To be sure the list is not very large and the corrections are of no great importance. Textual criticism, however, deals with minutiae. The list of passages in which the Targum alone indicates a various reading is larger. It is as follows:

II. 6, “from *the land* of Egypt”: from Egypt. II. 9, “therefore I will *yet* strive with you”: omit *yet*. III. 16, omit **עוד** after **יאמרו** but insert it after **יזכרו**. III. 20, “surely a woman rebels from her companion, so have ye rebelled against me”: surely *like as* [**כמו**] a woman. III. 21, “the weeping of the supplications [**בכי תחנוני**] of the children of Israel”: the children of Israel weep and sigh [**בכו ונאנחו = דבכין ומתאנחין**]. IV. 23, omit **ו** before **הנה**. IV. 29, **כל העיר** makes a difficulty because **בהן** in the next clause refers back to this: **כל קיריהון** is the reading of the Targum; the LXX strikes out the article reading **כל עיר**, showing that both felt difficulty. The latter is more likely to be the original text, and possibly the Targum gives a free translation of this. IV. 30, “lovers have rejected thee”: *thy* lovers—**עגבים** for **עגביך**. VI. 28, “all of them are turning aside to rebels” **כלם סרי סוררים**: all their princes are rebels = **כל שריהם סוררים**. X. 4, “with silver and with gold he decorates it” [**יפהו**]: he *covers* it (reading apparently **חפהו**). X. 8, “the instruction of vanities [**מוסר הבליים**], wood is it”: and because they served vanities—for of what value are they? [**ועל דפלחו לטעוותא ארי למא אנון**]. I suspect the Targumist had a different reading for **מוסר**, though what it was I am not able to say. The latter part of the sentence may be simply a free rendering. X. 21, for **השכילו** read **ישכילו**. XI. 14, “in the time of their crying to me on account of their evil”: in the time when thou prayest for them in the time of their evil—**בער** for **בעת** and **אלי** for **עליהם**, **קראם** for **קראך**. The Targum is the more natural reading, as the prophet has just been commanded *himself* not to pray for the people. XV. 13, “and in all thy borders”: omit *and*. XVII. 1, “*your* altars”: *their* altars. XVII. 3, “thy high places with sin” [**במתוך בחטאת**]: for sins because ye were worshiping vanity. This is a paraphrase, but it seems to point to **בחטאת במותוך**, simply reversing the order of the two words. This would

make the form חטאת regular also. XVIII. 4, כחמר : רטינא pointing to כ instead of כ. XX. 5, "all the treasure of this city": of this land. XX. 6, "and to Babylon thou shalt come" [תבוא]: shalt be led [תתובל] probably reading תובא]. XXI. 14, "and I will kindle a fire in her forest": in her city [עיר for יער]. XXII. 3, insert ו before אל-תחמסו. The preceding word ends in ו and the conjunction has probably dropped out under this influence. XXIII. 4, "and shall not be missing" (ולא יפקדו): and shall not tremble (evidently reading ולא יפחדו). XXIII. 8, "and from all the lands": omit all. XXV. 22, "and to your dreams": and to your dreamers of dreams; so also XXIX. 8 and XXXIV. 3, and this renders it possible that it is simply a case of free translation. XXVII. 20, omit כל. XXIX. 16, "that inhabits this city": this land. XXX. 21, omit את לבו. XXX. 23, insert ו before סער. XXXII. 21, "and with great fear" [מורא]: with a great vision [חזונא]. The Targum seems to have read or understood מראה. XXXII. 23, insert ו before לא עשו. XXXII. 32, one recension¹ (b) omits כהניהם. XXXIV. 4, for תתקטיל for תמות, which would seem to point to תומת. XXXIV. 9, "to lay service upon them, upon a Jew his brother each man" [ביהודי אחיהו איש]. The Targum has יהודאה יהודאי and this is the natural order in Hebrew also. איש, when used distributively as in this verse, generally comes at the beginning of the clause, as in this same chapter elsewhere, v. 10 איש את עבדו, v. 14 איש את אחיו. XXXIV. 12, (a) omits the first יהוה, which is certainly redundant in our present text. XXXV. 4, for בני חנן read בן חנן. In XXXVIII. 16, Zedekiah swears by Jehovah who made for us this soul; Targum (r) the soul, which is more accurate. XLII. 10, "if returning ye will dwell" [אם ישוב תשבנו], but it is generally the same verb which is found in the infinitive joined with a finite form. The Targum at least feels the difficulty, for it reads תשובו for the second word. The LXX., however, is probably correct in reversing the process and reading ישוב (καθίστατες). In XLIV. 3, omit המה (b); LXX. omits the last three words of the verse. In XLIV. 6 (ar) insert ו before לשממה. XLVI. 10 לאדני יהוה צבאות : (b) קדם " צבאות. In XLVIII. 30, omit ו from ולא. In XLVIII. 31 insert ו before אל אנשי. XLIX. 30, עליכם : עליהם, which is also given as קרי in Buxtorf. L. 40, for יהוה אלהים read יהוה.

We have then about twenty cases in which the Targum confirms the evidence of the LXX., and about fifty cases in which it alone witnesses to a different text from the one current among us. Probably I have overlooked some instances. But assuming this to be nearly correct, we may say roughly that in seventy passages the Targum helps us to settle the text of the book of Jeremiah. The amount of variation is the object of this inquiry, and until we have a critical edition of the Targum itself this may stand as an approximate result. It does not follow from the fact of variation that the Targum is always correct. That

¹ I have not always specified where a reading was not supported by all copies of the Targum.

must be decided in each instance separately. But the indications already given will show that in a considerable proportion of the passages cited (more than half, I judge) the Targum has preserved for us the better text. At least in settling our text it will not be safe to ignore this version.

As I have already indicated it is not always easy to determine when the Targum had our text. I have carefully excluded a number of cases in which nevertheless a different reading may have existed. Some one else may be able to find clear testimony among these uncertain sounds and I will therefore give a list of *possible variations*.

V. 10, "go up against [or upon] her walls" — בשרותיה, Targum בקרוהא possibly reading בעריה or even בשעריה. But as in the same verse we have "her branches" rendered "her citadels" this may be only an instance of interpretation by the translator. XIII. 17, "my soul shall weep because of pride" [גוה]: because your treasure passes from you—דערי מנכון יקרכון. The only way in which I can account for this translation is to suppose the Targum to have read גוה or בזה. XVI. 7, "and they shall not make them drink the cup of consolation for his father and his mother": each one for his father (inserting גבר = איש). XVII. 2, "their ashéras on a green tree": under every green tree (תחות כל for the על of M. T.). If תחת dropped out כל might be changed to על. "We shall take our revenge upon him" (xx. 10): we shall be revenged our revenge upon him. For נקחה the Targum may have read נקמה. "Rock of the plain" (xxi. 13) [צור המישר]: *fortified cities* does not seem a natural translation or even interpretation of these words; it seems to imply עיר מצור or ערי המצור. In Ps. xxxi. 22 we find עיר מצור. XXVI. 10, "the new gate" is in the Targum the *eastern* gate (so also xxxvi. 10), "And ye shall call me *and shall go* [והלכתם] and shall pray to me" (xxix. 12). For the words in italics the Targum has "and I will hear your prayer" [ואקבל צלותכון]. In xxxviii. 22 והנה: omit ו (b). This is a case where a translator might leave out the conjunction as not necessary to the sense. L. 15, for ידה we find ידיהון. LI. 55, "and will destroy from her a *great voice*" [קול גדול]: *great armies* [משרין סגיאין] which would, barring the plural, stand for חיל גדול. LII. 29, the Targum inserts אנלי before מירושלם [necessary to the sense].

I have not kept a list of the passages where the discrepancy of M. T., LXX. and Targum is so great as to show that no one of the translators was able to make out what his text meant. We should be justified in concluding from such discrepancy that the text has been corrupted beyond present possibility of emendation. This would be only a negative result however. The data which have been presented seem to me to have some positive value.

CYLINDER B OF THE ESARHADDON INSCRIPTIONS (11⁴⁸₃₁₅4.
BRITISH MUSEUM; III R.15-16) TRANSLITERATED
AND TRANSLATED.

BY ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, PH. D.,

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

This cylinder has usually been called the "Broken Cylinder" or C, but I have preferred to designate it as B, because it is larger, better preserved and, perhaps, more important than the unnumbered cylinder, which I have called C.¹ B was first published in Layard's *Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character from Assyrian Monuments* (London, 1851), pp. 54-58, under the title "On lower half of an Hexagonal object of Baked Clay." It appeared again in III R. 15, 16, edited by George Smith. This edition is very much better than that of Layard, but, on account of the extremely bad condition of the original of B, many errors are to be found in it. Columns I., II. and V. 12-25 were published by Budge in *History of Esarhaddon* (London, 1880). Budge's edition is little, if any, better than George Smith's. Cf. Delitzsch's review in the *Literarisches Centralblatt*, May 21, 1881. Column I. 2-25 has been published by Delitzsch in his *Assyrische Lesestuecke*, 3d edition, p. 117, No. 7, and by Bruto Teloni in his *Chrestomazia Assira* (Firenze, 1887), pp. 60-62, and, finally, Column V., 12-27 by Schrader in his *Zur Kritik der Inschriften Tiglathpilesers II, des Asarhaddon und des Asurbani-pal* (Berlin, 1880).

Translations of Cylinder B have been published by Menant, *Annales des Rois d'Assyrie* (Paris, 1874); by Fox Talbot, *Records of the Past*, vol. III. and in the *North British Review*, 1870, [Column I.]; by Budge, *History of Esarhaddon*, [Columns I., II. and V. 12-25]; by Delitzsch, in Mürdter's *Kurzgefasste Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens* (Stuttgart, 1882), p. 207, [Column I. 2-25]; by Teloni, *Chrestomazia Assira*, pp. 60-62, [Column I. 2-25]. Cf. also Delitzsch in *Wo lag das Paradies* and Schrader in *KGF.* and *KAT.*

During the summer of 1885, while working in the Assyrian Room of the British Museum, I collated Cylinders A and B and copied C. The results of this collation have been published in the April (1887) number of *HEBRAICA* and later in my Leipzig Inaugural-dissertation. Many important and hitherto unnoticed corrections and readings will be found in these "Textual Notes."

¹ Published for the first time in the October (1887) *HEBRAICA*. Cf. also my Leipzig Inaugural-dissertation, *Cylinder A of the Esarhaddon Inscriptions*, etc.

There are many difficult words and idioms in Cylinder B and I have offered several new transliterations and translations. In a future number of *HEBRAICA*, I will discuss, among others, the following words and combinations: ašûr, kuššu, nîtu, kutû, pariktu, nabâlu, mi-šid(?), dâbtu, bâşu, puḳuttu, the names of the eight kings in column IV. 19-22, my combination of the lines 1-10, column V. (hitherto incorrectly understood), V. 7, ešḳu, aḥaztu (= property, Eigenthum), amuhḥaşunu, zak-mukku (= ראש השנה), izkurû (A, I. 42), kullumu, asî, ummân-manda, tâtîd, nâbi', šâtu (= šadâdu), aktabišu ahu[lap](?), šakâtu, askuppât agurrê, bîtanni (= ביתן), sikkatu, A, VI. 1-10, A, VI. 13, amkira şurraşun, etc., etc.

In the transliteration, I have practically followed the method of the Delitzsch school. In the October (1887) *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society*, Paul Haupt proposes another "new system of transliteration for the Semitic sounds." It remains to be seen whether this attempt will survive any longer than his previous one set forth with so much confidence in his *Beitrag zur assyr. Lautlehre*.

To my friend, Mr. Theo. G. Pinches of the British Museum, I am indebted for many readings to be found in the "Textual Notes," which were published in April *HEBRAICA*, 1887. I am also under obligations to my teacher, Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, for many suggestions and renderings.

TRANSLITERATION.

CYLINDER B.

- I. 1. ušaršid ušašbit(?).....
 labbiš annadirma iššariḫ kabitti
 aššu epêš šarrûti bit abê'a nipir(?) šangûti'a
 ana Ašûr Sin Šamaš Bêl Nabû u Nêrgal
5. Ištar ša Ninâ Ištar ša Arba'il
 kâtî aššîma imgurû kibîti
 ina annišunu kêni....takiltu(?)
 ištaparûnima alik lâ kalâta
 idâka nittallakma ninâra garêka
10. ištên ûme šinâ ûme ûl uḫḫi pân ummâni'a ûl adgul
 arkâ ûl âmur piḫitti sîsê šimitti nîri
 ûl unût taḫâzi'a ûl ašûr
 šîdêt girri'a ûl ašpuk
 raggu kuššu Šabâtu dannat kušši ûl âdur
15. kîma iššûri si-si-in-ni mupparši
 ana sakâp za'êri'a aptâ idâ'a
 ḥarrân Ninâ paškiš urruḫiḫ ardîma
 ellamû'a ina iršiti Hanigalbat(?) gimir ḫurâdêšun
 širûti pân girri'a šabtûma ušâlû kakkêšun
20. puluḫti ilâni rabûti bêlê'a išḫupšunûtima
 tib taḫâzi'a danni êmurûma êmû maḫḫutiš(?)
 Ištar bêlit ḫabli taḫâzi râ'imat šangûti'a
 idâ'a tâzizma ḫašatsunu tašbir
 taḫâzišunu raksû tapṭurma
25. ina puḫrišunu iḫbû umma annû šarani
 ina kibîti širti idâ'a ittanashaṛû iḫbû

- Col. II. 1.
 karassu idkêma ana Nin-gal-mu(?)
 šalaṭ Ūru ardu dâgil pâni'a
 nîtu ilmêšuma išbatu mûšâšu
5. ultu Ašûr Šamaš Bêl u Nabû Ištar ša Ninâ
 Ištar ša Arba'il iâti Ašûrahiddin
 ina kussê abê'a ṭâbiš ušêšibûnima

TRANSLATION.

CYLINDER B.

- Col. I. 1.
 I was fierce like a lion and my heart (Gemüth) was enraged.
 To exercise the sovereignty of my father's house and to clothe my
 priestly office,
 to Ašûr, Sin, Šamaš, Bel, Nabu and Nergal,
5. Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela,
 I raised my hand and they looked with favor on my petition.
 In their eternal mercy, an oracle
 they sent me, viz.: "Go, do not delay;
 we will march at thy side and will subjugate thy enemies."
10. One day, two days I did not wait, the front of my army I did not
 look upon,
 the rear I did not see, the appointments of my yoked horses,
 the weapons for my battle I did not inspect,
 provisions for my campaign I did not issue.
 The furious cold of the month Šabātu, the fierceness of the cold, I
 did not fear.
15. Like a flying si-si-in-ni bird
 for the overthrow of my enemies, I opened out my forces.
 The road to Nineveh, with difficulty and haste, I descended.
 Before me in Hanigalbat, all of their lofty warriors
 seized the front of my expedition and forced a battle.
20. The fear of the great gods, my lords, overwhelmed them,
 the approach of my mighty battle they saw and they became
 like
 Istar, the mistress of onslaught and battle, the lover of my priestly
 office,
 stood at my side and broke their bows.
 Their compact line of battle she broke up
25. and in their assembly they cried: "This is our king."
- Col. II. 1.
 his camp-baggage he gathered together and against
 Nin-gal-mu,
 governor of Uru, a servant dependent on me,
 with a force he surrounded him and seized his exits.
5. From the time that Ašûr, Šamas, Bêl and Nabû, Ištar of Nineveh,
 Ištar of Arbela, me Esarhaddon
 on the throne of my fathers, had firmly seated

- bêlût mâti ušadgilû pâni'a šû ûl iplah
nade ahê ûl iršîma ardî ûl umaššîr
10. u rakbušu adî mahri'a
ûl išpuramma šulmu šarrûti'a ûl iš'al
epšêtêšu limnêtê ina kirib Ninâ ašmêma
libbi igugma iššariḥ kabittî šudšâkê'a
piḥâtî ša pâti mâtišu uma'ir šîruššu
15. u šû Nabû-zêr-napišti-uštêšîr barânû nabalkattânu
alâk ummâni'a išmêma ara Elamti kî šêlabis innabit
aššu mâmît ilâni rabûti ša êparku¹(?) Ašûr Sin Šamaš
Bêl u Nabû annu kabtu emêdûšuma
kirib Elamti inârûšu ina kakki
20. Na'id-Marduk ahûšu epšêt Elamti
ša ana ahêšu êteppušu êmurma
ultu Elamti innabtamma ana epêš ardûti'a
ana Aššûr illikamma ušallâ bêlûtî
Tâmtim ana siḫirtiša ridût ahêšu usadgil pânuššu
25. šattišamma lâ naparkâ itti tamartešu kabitte
ana Ninâ illikamma unaššaḳa šêpê'a
Abdimilkûtu šar Šîdûni
lâ pâliḥ bêlûtî'a lâ šêmû zikir šapti'a
ša elî tâmtim gallati ittakluma islû nîri'a
30. Šîdûni âl tuklatišu ša kirib tâmti nadû
(Cf. Cylinder A, I, 9, sqq.)

Col. III. (Cf. Cylinder A, II, 6, sqq.)

1. ina iršit Hubuṣ[na(?)] adî gimîr ummânišu]
urassiba [ina kakki].

Akbus kišâdi nišê [Ḥilakki]

Du'ua âšibût [ḥuršâni]

5. ša têḫi Tabala
ša elî šadêšunu dannûti [ittaklûma]
ultu ûme pâni lâ kitnu[šû ana nîri]
XXI âlânišunu dannûti adî [âlâni siḫrûti]
ša limêtišunu almê ak[šud ašlula šallatsun]

¹ This reading is doubtful. The text is badly broken. One can read ê-tê-ku as well as ê-par-ku.

and the dominion of the land had trusted to me, he did not fear,
he did not turn aside, and did not cease to be my servant,

10. but his messenger, into my presence,
he did not send, concerning the prosperity of my kingdom he did
not ask.

Concerning his evil deeds in the midst of Nineveh I heard
and my heart was angry and my liver (or heart) was enraged.
My superior-officers, the prefects of the border of his land, I sent
against him

15. and he, Nabu-zêr-napišti-uštêšîr, a robber and rebel,
of the march of my army heard, and, like a fox, he fled to Elam.
As the oath of the great gods Ašûr, Sin, Šamaš,
Bêl and Nabû, a heavy punishment they placed on him, and
in the midst of Elam they subjugated him with the sword.

20. Na'id-Marduk, his brother, the affairs of Elam,
which I had done to his brother, saw and
from Elam he fled and to become my servant
to Assyria came and besought my lordship.
The land of Tamtim, in its whole extent, the dominion of his
brother, I entrusted to him.

25. Yearly, without fail, with his heavy present,
to Nineveh he came and kissed my feet.
Abdimilkutu, King of Sidon,
who did not fear my lordship, who did not listen to the command
of my lip,
who trusted to the vast sea and threw off my yoke,
Sidon, his principal city, which is situated in the midst of the sea.

Col. III.

[And Tê'ušpa of Gimir, an um m â n - m a n d a, whose residence was
afar off] in the Hubušna territory, [together with the whole of his
army],
I ran through [with the sword].

I trampled on the necks of the men of [Hilakki],
Du'ua, the inhabitants of [the mountain-ridges],

5. which lie in the vicinity of Tabala ;
who, to their mighty mountains [trusted, and]
from days of old had not been subject [to any yoke];
XXI of their powerful cities, together with [the small cities]
of their territory, I besieged, captured, [carried away their spoil],

10. abbul aḳḳur ina išâ[ti aḳmu]
sitûtêšunu ša ḥittu [u ḳullultu]
lâ išû kabtu nîr bēlûti'a êmidsunûti.

Adiš Barnakâ
âšibûti Tilašûri ša ina pî [nisê]

15. Mihrânu Pitânu inambû zikir[šun]

Usappih nišê Mannâ ḳutû lâ sanḳu
u ummânišu Iṣpakâ Azguzâ
kidru lâ mušêzibišu anâr ina kakki.

-
- Ašlul Bît-Dakkûri ša kirib Kaldi aiab Bâbili
20. akmu Šamas-ibni šarrišu ishappu ḥabbilu
lâ pâliḥu zikri bēl bēlê
ša eḳlê aplê Bâbili u Barsap
ina pariḳti itbaluma utêru ramânuš
aššu anâku puluḥtu Bêl u Nabû idû
25. eḳlê šâtina utërma pân aplê Bâbili
u Barsap ušadgil
Nabû-šallim apal Balasu
[ina kus]sêšu ušêšibma išât abšâni.

Col. IV. 1. nišu šêpêšun
. ukîn elišun

-
- [Patušarra na]gû ša itê bît MUN
[ša kirib Madâ rūḳûti] ša pâti Bikni šadu uknê
5. [ša ina šarrâni abê'a] mamma lâ ikbusu iršitim mâtišun
[Šidirparna Epa]rna ḥazanâti dannûte
[ša lâ kitnušû ana nî]ri šâšunu adî nišêšunu
[sîsê rukûbêšunu] alpê šêni uduri
[šallatsun kabittu] ašlula ana kirib Aššûr.

-
10. [Bâzu] nagû ša ašaršu rūḳu
[mi-šid(?) na]bâli ḳaḳḳar dâbtu ašar šumâme
[CXL] kasbu ḳaḳḳar bâši puḳuttu u aban pî-šabîti
ašar širi u akrabi kîma zirbâbê malû ugaru
XX kasbu Ḥazû šaddî sag-gil-mud
15. ana arki'a umašširma êtiḳ

10. I destroyed, tore down and with fire [I burned].
 Upon the rest of them, who sin [and crimes]
 had not committed, I placed the heavy yoke of my lordship.

I trampled upon Barnaki ,
 the inhabitants of Tilašûri who, in the language of [the people]

15. Mihrânu Pitanu they call [their] name.

I scattered the men of Minni, the *ku t û*, the unsubmissive
 and his army. Išpaka of Azguza—
 an alliance that did not save him—I subdued with the sword.

-
- I despoiled Bît-Dakkûri, which is in Kaldi, an enemy of Babylon,
 20. I bound Šamaš-ibni, its king, a foolish (?), bad person,
 who did not fear the renown of the lord of lords,
 who had taken away the fields of the Babylonians and Borsippans
 by force and had turned them to his own use.
 Because I knew the fear of Bêl and Nabû,
 25. these fields I returned, to the Babylonians
 and Borsippans I entrusted.
 Nabû-šallim, son of Balasu,
 [on his] throne I placed and he was tribute to me.

Col IV. 1.

[Patušarra], a district on the borders of
 [which is in the midst of the far-off Medes], on the borders of
 Bikni, a mountain of alabaster stone,

5. the territory of whose land no one [among the kings, my fathers,
 had trodden];
 [Šidirparna, Eparna], the powerful city-officers,
 [who were not subject to any yoke], they themselves with their men,
 [horses, chariots], oxen, sheep, dromedaries,
 [their heavy spoil], I carried away into the midst of Assyria.
-
10. [Bâzu], a district, whose situation is afar off,
 [a mi-šid (?)] of land, a wearisome country, a barren place,
 [CLX] kasbu of swampy ground, thorny undergrowth, and gazelle-
 mouth stone,
 where snakes and scorpions, like grasshoppers, fill the country;
 XX kasbu of Hazû, a mountain of sag-gil-mud stone,
 15. I left behind me and I marched.

nagû šû'atu ša ultu ûme ullûti
lâ illiku šarru pâni maḥri'a
ina kibît Ašûr bêli'a ina kirbišu šalânîš attallak
Kîsu šar Hal(?)dili Akbaru šar Ilpi'ate

20. Mansaku šar Magalaṇi Iapa' šarrat Diḥrâni

Ḥabisu šar Kadaba' Niḥaru šar Ga'pâni
Ba'ilu šarrat Iḥilu Ḥabaziru šar Buda'
VIII šarrâni ša kirib nagê sû'atu adûk
kîma* aštâdi ḡagar ḡurâdêšun

25. ilânîšunu namkûrišunu bušâšunu u nišêšunu ašlula ana kirib

Aššûr

Lâlê šar Iadi' ša lapân kakkê['a ipparšidu]

(Cf. Cylinder A, IV, 41, sqq.)

Col. V. [Ina ûmêšuma êkal maḥirte ša kirib Ninâ]

ša [šarrâni âlik maḥri abê'a ušêpišû]
ana šu[têšur karâši paḡâdi murniskê]
parê narkabâti [bêlê unût taḡâzi]
u šallat nakirê gi[mir mimma šumšu]

5. ša Ašûr šar ilâni ana eški šarrûti'a išruḡa

ana šitmur sîsê šitamduḡ narkabâti
ašru šû'atu îmišannima nišê matâti ḡubut ḡašti'a
allu umšikku ušaššîšunûtima ilbinû libnâti
êkallu šiḡra šû'atu ana siḡirtiša aḡ[ḡurma]

10. ḡaḡḡaru ma'du kîma aḡaztimma ultu libbi eklē [abtuḡma]

elîšu ušraddi ina pîli aban šadi

tamlâ ušmalli adkêma šarrâni Ḥatti u êbir tâmti

* * * * *

* * * * *

25. u šarrâni ša Iatnana ḡabal tâmtim

naphar(?) XXII šarrâni Hatti âḡi tâmtim ḡabal tâmtim kališunu
uma'iršunûtima ḡušûrê rabûti

(Cf. Cylinder A, V, 15, sqq.)

Col. VI. (Cf. Cylinder A, VI, 39, sqq.)

šamnu rêštu šamnu ḡu-la amuḡḡašunu ušaški
ina kibît Ašûr šar ilâni Aššûr kâlišunu

* Cf. Textual Notes, in loco (April HEBRAICA, 1887).

That district, where, from days of old,
no king before me had marched,
by the command of Ašûr, my lord, into its midst I marched victo-
riously.

Kîsu, king of Haldili; Akbaru, king of Ilpi'ate;

20. Mansaku, king of Magalani; Iapa', queen of Dihrâni;
Habisu, king of Kadaba'; Niḥaru, king of Ga'pâni;
Ba'ilu, queen of Iḥilu; Habaziru, king of Buda',
VIII kings of that district I killed.

Like I cast the corpses of their warriors.

25. Their gods, property, possessions, and men I carried away to
Assyria.

Lâlê, king of Iadi', who before my weapons [had fled], etc.

Col. V. [At that time, the former palace, which is in Nineveh],
which [the kings, my forefathers had caused to be built];
for the [stowing away of the camp, for the sheltering of the horses]
and bulls, chariots, [weapons, utensils of war],
and the spoil of the enemies, [everything of every description],

5. which Ašûr, the king of the gods, for the strengthening of my king-
dom had presented,

for the stalling of the horses, hitching up of the chariots,
that place had become too small for me, and the men of the coun-
tries, the booty of my bow,

allu umšikku I caused them to carry and they made bricks.

That small palace I tore down entirely, and

10. a large quantity of ground, in accordance with my means, from the
midst of the fields I cut off, and

added to it. With freestone, a stone of the mountain

I filled out its terrace. I assembled the kings of Ḥatti and
beyond the sea, * * * *

* * * * *

25. and the kings of Iatnana in the midst of the sea—
in all XXII kings of Ḥatti, of the sea-coast, of the midst of the sea,
all of them;

to all of these I gave my commands, and large beams, etc., etc.

Col. VI. The best oil I offered (??) them, I caused them to drink.

By the command of Ašûr, king of the gods, and the gods of As-
syria, all of them,

ina tûb šêrê ħud libbi nummur kabitti

5. šêbê littûte kiribša dâriš

lurmêma lušbâ lalâša

ina za k - mu k k i arĥi rêštî kullat murniskê

parê bêlê gammalê unût taĥâzi

gimir ummâni šallat nakirê

10. šattišamma lâ naparkâ lupĥida kiribša

kirib êkalli šātu sêdu damĥu lamassu damĥu

nâšir kibsi šarrûti'a muĥadû kabitti'a

etc., etc., etc.

[Cf. HEBRAICA, Jan., 1888, and my "Cylinder A of the Esarhaddon Inscriptions, etc.," where B, VI. 13-22, is transliterated and translated.]

- in health of body, joy of heart, cheerfulness of spirit,
5. abundance of offspring, in its midst continually
may I dwell and may its fullness be sufficient.
On the beginning of the year, in the first month, all of the horses,
bulls, camels, weapons, utensils of war,
all the soldiers, the spoil of my enemies,
10. yearly, without fail, may I store away within it.
Within this palace, may gracious bull-divinities and gracious
colossi,
protecting the footsteps of my majesty, causing my spirits to
rejoice, etc., etc.

NOTES ON THE PSALMS.

BY SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D. D., LL. D.,

London, England.

- II. 12. The correct translation is that given by Jerome, "adore pure" *worship purely*. See my "On a Fresh Revision of the English Old Testament," p. 57.
- IV. 3. See the "Fresh Revision," p. 72.
- VI. 11. The Imperfects in this verse should be rendered "they shall be," etc.; not "let them be."
- VIII. 2. הִנֵּה. This is a difficult form. It is an Imperative, not an Infinitive, and is differently explained by critics. If the reading be genuine, the translation is "which glory of thine set thou above the heavens (also)." Verse 5. See "Fresh Revision," p. 78.
- XII. 7. עֵלִיל *crucible*, of earth? Ewald's translation is improbable. Hupfeld's "in the earth" gives a doubtful meaning to ל prefixed.
- XVI. 3. Perhaps the best way to take this difficult verse is to render "as to the saints who are in the land and the nobles, all my pleasure is in them." Ewald's exposition of this Psalm is not good; Hupfeld's is somewhat better. In the tenth verse the singular reading "thy pious one" is not original, and the plural, "thy pious ones," is right. Verse 5. הוֹמִיךְ, cf. Gesenius and Ewald on the word. The latter not so good as the former. It is the Participle of Qal (Lehrgebäude, p. 308). Internal evidence fails to find a suitable occasion for this Psalm in the life of David. It does not agree well with his position when he was in the wilderness of Ziph (see 1 Sam. xxvi. 19). A much later time than David's must be assigned to it. Verse 4. מִהָרִי. This verb means here as elsewhere *to buy*; "who buy another (god)." The rendering adopted by many, *exchange*, is not exactly suitable; for it requires a peculiar supplementing, exchange (Jehovah) (for) another; or the improbable, *take in exchange* another. Other observations on this Psalm may be found in my "Revision of the English Old Testament," pp. 67, 68.
- XVIII. Hupfeld unnecessarily and with weak reasons denies the Davidic authorship. The last two verses proceed from a later hand than the preceding part.
- XIX. This Psalm is made up of two separate pieces. Ewald is wrongly blamed by Jennings and Lowe for holding this opinion. The first part is badly translated in the authorized version. The latter part of verse 4 is incorrect in Kamphausen. Verse 5. קו not *sound*, as Gesenius and Ewald suppose,

but *measure, expanse, region*, what a measuring-line stretches over. Here Hupfeld is right. The fourth verse does not agree well with 3 and 5, and it has therefore been interpreted in various ways.

XXII. 17. The best way to interpret the verse is, "they enclose me, my hands and feet, like the lion," i. e. they enclose my whole person, enclose me altogether so that I cannot escape. Hupfeld's note on the verse is excellent; and Gesenius has also a good one upon it (*Thesaurus*, p. 671). Ewald's is disappointing. The versions generally take the word *as the lion* for a verb, *ὑποξαν, ἡσχυναν*, *vinxerant, foderunt*; but a verb is not easily got out of the Masoretic reading, which must be altered for the purpose. It is utterly improbable that it is a participle, instead of a noun, in the plural construct; and to render it as "piercing" is an unlucky guess. To say with Ewald that the present reading is owing to Christian-Jewish polemics, is mere conjecture. It is superfluous to state that the 22d Psalm is not Messianic. How could the Messiah speak as in the 7th verse? If some parts be applied to Christ in the New Testament that is no sound reason for thinking that the original writer meant it so. A pious sufferer in the time of the exile is the speaker; and his enemies are heathen persecutors. I do not believe that he personifies the Jewish people. Rather does he speak in his own name and of himself.

XXV. 11. The verb וְסִלַּחְתָּ is difficult of explanation; and the grammars do not present a satisfactory solution of it. See Ewald's *Lehrbuch*, § 344 b. Nordheimer's *Grammar*, vol. II. § 985. 1. Gesenius's by Roediger, English translation, § 126 d. The entire subject of the Hebrew tenses is not yet cleared up; and I know that Hupfeld, despairing of getting a satisfactory solution of the problem, abandoned the publication of his Hebrew grammar after its commencement. Too many divisions and distinctions have been introduced. In the present case it is probable that the writer neglected to write a verb just before that which perplexed the reader. As the passage stands, the ו conversive prefixed to the Perfect, or as some prefer to call it Waw consecutive, gives it the sense of an Imperfect or Future which, expressing strong hope or assurance, is allied to the Imperative of supplication, "pardon mine iniquity." I am fully aware that this is an imperfect explanation; but it is better than those offered in the grammars.

XXIX. 2. In holy or festal adornment, angels being conceived as clothed in festal dress before God's throne. Hupfeld's explanation is incorrect here; but De Wette, following Gesenius, has rightly interpreted the phrase.

XXXII. 9. The last clause of this verse is extremely difficult. I translate it, "With bit and bridle their youth must be bound; they do not come near thee *otherwise*." As the noun יָדַי occurs in Psalm CIII. 5, meaning time of life, it probably means the same here; especially *youth*, implying vigor, strength. Many understand it in the sense of *ornament* or *trappings*. Hupfeld's inter-

pretation seems far-fetched; and Kamphausen gives no clear solution. One is tempted to suppose the text corrupt. Ewald gives a meaning to עֵרִי which cannot be accepted, viz.: *cheek*; so that his interpretation turns aside from the true one.

XXXVI. 3. This is a most perplexing verse. I should render it, "For it (the oracle of transgression within his heart) has made it smooth to him in his eyes so as to find his iniquity [and] to hate;" in other words, the secret utterances of the wicked man's heart make the way of finding out his iniquity and cherishing hatred an easy thing to him. It gives him satisfaction both to seek out his misdeeds, and gratify his hatred. The long, elaborate and ingenious note of Hupfeld is not convincing. Nor can I adopt altogether the interpretation given by Ewald. Kamphausen wavers. The true sense turns in a great degree on the subject of הַחֵלֶק whether it be *God* or the *oracle*.

XXXVII. 38. It is almost unnecessary to remark that the latter clause of this verse is wrongly translated in the received version. The correct rendering spoils the text for funeral sermons. It is, "that there is a posterity to the man of peace;" posterity being a blessing under the Old Testament. Gesenius has properly recorded this signification, but the present passage is not given in his examples of it. None but Hengstenberg would deny that the Hebrew word has the sense in question.

XXXIX. 3. The first half of this verse can only mean "I was dumb in silence, I held my peace *without gladness*," etc., or, "far from joyfulness I was silent." The difficult word is rightly explained by Hupfeld and Kamphausen; wrongly by Ewald, who has "I was silent of the good" (I missed). Delitzsch renders most improbably "without prosperity," that is, without taking note of it; while Jennings and Lowe resort to the far-fetched sense: without [gaining] any good [therefrom]. DeWette's note and translation are unsatisfactory, "I was silent from everything," good as well as evil.

XLII. 5. This verse, upon which many interpretations and comments have been spent, may be best translated, "These things will I call to mind, and pour out my soul in me, that I passed in the multitude, walked in solemn procession to the house of God, with the voice of joy and praise, a festival-keeping throng." The psalmist expresses his remembrance of the past, rather than his longing and hope in relation to the future. Hupfeld accumulates a variety of opinions about the different words of the verse, amid which the reader may easily lose a clear apprehension of the critic's own interpretation. Inclining to an opposite extreme of Ewald's method, he balances too much.

XLV. There is little doubt about this Psalm being an epithalamium composed on the marriage of Solomon with the daughter of a Tyrian king. Being a secular poem, like the 72d, the Jews interpreted it allegorically; and this method of exegesis passed over to the early Christians, leading them to apply

it to Messiah. But the Messianic interpretation is foreign to the original sense, and can only be carried through the Psalm by thrusting forced meanings upon the words. I see no good reason for referring the Psalm to Jeroboam II., as Ewald does; a conjecture which was probably prompted by the more frequent intercourse of the northern kingdom with the Tyrians; much less for referring it with Hitzig to the marriage of Ahab with Jezebel. Nor is Delitzsch's conjecture probable that the poem was meant to celebrate Joram's marriage with Athaliah. The Psalm has its difficulties. In the 7th verse occurs "thy God's throne," i. e. thy divine throne, etc.; and the version "thy throne, O God," is incorrect; for the plural אֱלֹהִים cannot be applied to one king. It may perhaps be used of kings, as in the 82d Psalm; but even there Hupfeld denies it that sense. In verse 9, קִבִּי must either be a plural meaning *strings, music of stringed instruments*, or, of *Armenia, Armenian*. The former interpretation is usually adopted; but the use of the word for מְבִים is without analogy. Gesenius makes as good an attempt as there can be to explain the form of the word (*Lehrgebäude*, pp. 525-6); and Ewald is still less satisfactory. It is better on the whole to take it as it occurs in Jer. LI. 27, where a province of Armenia is meant. Notwithstanding the authority of Jerome and of Hupfeld, as well as Hitzig, "the daughter of Tyre" in the 13th verse must mean, *the Tyrians, the inhabitants of the city*, especially the males. The translation "O daughter of Tyre" comes awkwardly with *and* before it, after the preceding words. See "Fresh Revision," p. 77.

XLVIII. 3. This verse is difficult. I translate it, "beautiful in elevation, the joy of the whole earth is Mount Zion; in the remotest north is the city of the great King." The explanation of "the remotest north" given by Ewald and Hitzig must be rejected. Gesenius and DeWette come very near the true sense; but Hupfeld's interpretation is the best, which supposes the contrast to be with Sinai in the south. The sense "sides" is wrong in this place; and to take the clause "remotest north" in close connection with Mount Zion is erroneous, because Zion was in the south of the city. The word יִרְכָּתִי does not mean "angle," as some render it. The meaning would be greatly simplified if we could suppose with Olshausen that the two words, "extremities of the north," were a marginal gloss that was taken into the text; and Kamphausen is inclined to adopt the suggestion.

LI. This Psalm is not David's, but is of the exile date as shown by the 20th verse. The conception of sin as committed against God alone, the offering of a broken spirit being more acceptable to him than material sacrifices, and the character of the diction are all alien to the time of David. But the suitability of the 16th verse to the title has led many to suppose that it is David's penitential utterances. Yet it is difficult to reconcile the 6th verse with Davidic authorship. How could adultery and murder be sins against

God alone? The last two verses create a great difficulty, as they appear inconsistent with what is said immediately before about the particular sacrifices with which God is well pleased. Hence many have thought them a late addition, not a part of the original composition. This, however, is a bold assumption. Taking them as properly belonging to the Psalm, we suppose the meaning to be, that the restored people would offer sacrifices in the divinely appointed place with hearts purified by adversity; sacrifices presented thus being the only acceptable ones. The 14th verse (second clause) should be rendered "and with a willing spirit support me." The spirit is the Psalmist's, but given by God. The word למען in the 5th verse means as usual "in order that," and is always *telic*, implying purpose; though cause and effect were not logically separated by the Jews. It may appear strange to us to interpret an author so as to make him say "I have done evil in order that thou mightest be justified in thy sentence;" but the Jews referred all things to the immediate influence and action of God, not hesitating to say *he* hardened Pharaoh's heart that he should refuse to let the Israelites go free; that *he* creates evil (Isa. XLV. 7); and that *he* inclined the Egyptians' minds to give jewels and ornaments to the Israelites, who borrowed without the idea of repaying, "*he* hath blinded their eyes," etc. (John XII. 40). The idea in the 7th verse approaches nearer to that of original sin than in any other passage in the Old Testament; but it does not state that which theologians mean by the phrase. We should remember that the language is that of poetry, not prose; and that poetry exaggerates. All that is meant is that the writer speaks of himself as inheriting a nature with the seeds of sin in it—a nature corrupt and inclined to sin from the earliest years. The language does not imply that man *sins in Adam*; or that the sin of Adam is *imputed* to him. Neither does it imply that he is *wholly* corrupt, without freedom of will to think and do good; and it is entirely incorrect to say that "in iniquity" and "in sin" are predicated of his parent, not of himself.

- LIII. The greater part of this Psalm is a repetition of the xivth; and critics have puzzled over the question how the sameness is to be accounted for. Neither seems to be exactly in its original state; but the LIId is nearer it than the xivth. David himself was not the author of them, for they belong to the time of the captivity. The alterations in the one or the other are not systematically or deliberately made. A few may have arisen from subsequent reflection; but most took place in the course of transcription or traditional transmission. Intentional adaptation of the first Psalm in the second to some particular occasion is unlikely. The change of Jehovah into Elohim proceeds from the collector of the second book, of which the Psalm is a part.
- LV. This Psalm is obviously later than David, so that Ahithophel is not the treacherous friend described. Verses 7-9 show that the poet lived among

enemies in the same city, that is, Jerusalem. The assertion made by Lowe and Jennings that the Psalm "teems with Davidic idioms" is wholly incorrect. Hitzig's opinion that Jeremiah was the author is favored by various expressions; but the tone is hardly that of the prophet. The writer lived at the time when the city was besieged by the Babylonians, and society was in a state of confusion. He was in a very excited state of mind, prays against his enemies, and especially against a friend who had proved faithless. The sequence of the verses is so loose and disconnected, that Hupfeld believes in displacement of certain portions, 13-15, 20b, 21, 22, 24. But this is an unnecessary assumption. The writer's feelings and perilous situation account for his broken statements. The latter part of the 20th verse, which is introduced abruptly, is very difficult. "They who have no changes, and they fear not God." The word **חֲלִיפוֹת** cannot apply to a moral change, though Gesenius gives that meaning to it, so that the sense is not "they do not change for the better;" neither is it "they do not change from prosperity to adversity." Looking to the use of the word in Job xiv. 14, I would venture to propose the interpretation "they do not change their post," as soldiers do who keep watch in turn and are relieved. They adhere to their post, that is, they remain continually and obstinately in the same sinful position. They are always at their sinful post. The attempts of Ewald and Hupfeld to find a different sense for the word are unsuccessful.

LVI. The received version of the 5th verse is unintelligible. It should be, "by God's help I will praise *his word*," i. e. this promise fulfilled to me. In the 11th verse, where the clause is repeated, the suffix to **דָּבָר** cannot be dispensed with. There can be little doubt that **פָּלַט** in verse 8 should be **פָּלַם**, as Ewald conjectures. He is followed by Olshausen and Hupfeld.

LVII. Probably from the same author as that of LVI., and so not David. The 4th verse should be rendered, "he that pants for me (my persecutor) has reproached." The clause is abruptly and awkwardly introduced. The verb **אִשְׁכַּבָּה** in the 5th verse creates great difficulty. If it be a genuine reading, it should be rendered, "I must lie with the fiery ones, the sons of men," etc.; though one would expect the prefix **ל** before **לֹהֲטִים**; cf. Isa. l. 11. The various conjectures respecting the passage may be seen in Hupfeld, who takes refuge in a corruption of the text, which he does too often.

LVIII. Verse 2 should probably be rendered, "Is the righteousness which you should speak really dumb? do you judge uprightly the sons of men?" Many point **אֱלֹם** differently, and propose **אֱלֹם** for **אֱלִים**, i. e., "ye gods." Verse 10. Translate, "whether fresh or burning, He (God) will sweep them away." The words are variously interpreted. Verse 9. **תִּמָּס** is a noun, not an apocopated future Hiph. of **מָסָה**, as Gesenius, followed by Hengstenberg, supposes.

LX. Verse 6. Translate "thou gavest to them who fear thee a banner to flee to from before the bow." Verse 6 is ironical. "Shout in triumph over me, O Philistia." But this does not suit the context, and the reading should probably be, as in Psalm CVIII. 10, "Over Philistia I will shout in triumph." In verse 5, thou hast given us to drink wine of reeling, the יין should be pointed as construct. Here it is absolute by mistake. The Psalm is often referred, along with the LXIV., to Maccabean times. But this does not clearly follow from internal evidence. It belongs to a time when the nation was in a downcast and disastrous state, perhaps in exile.

LXIV. 7th verse. תִּמְנוּ. This verb in the first person plural gives no good sense. It should be תִּמְנוּ, they "have completed." The 8th verse reads properly, "and God shoots them; an arrow (flies) suddenly; their wounds are (there)." The accent is against the union of יין with the preceding context. Verse 9. It is better with Hupfeld to alter a single point in the verb and so translate, "and He will cause *it* to fall upon (or destroy) them, *their tongue*." The rendering of DeWette is not bad, "their tongues will cause them to fall upon one another." Ewald, whom Hengstenberg follows, is less happy in his exegesis of the words.

LXV. 6th verse. Render "of all the ends of the earth and of the sea, distant (as they are)." This is contrary to the accents, but required by the sense. The translation, "of the distant parts of the sea," is inconsistent.

LXVI. Ewald appears to be right in dividing this Psalm into two parts. The first is national, descriptive of national calamities, and perhaps referring to the invasion of the land by Sennacherib. The second, verses 13-20, is personal, expressing the feelings of a pious Israelite; and its date is earlier than the first.

LXVIII. This Psalm is the most difficult of interpretation among all that form the collection, and has given rise to a greater number of separate dissertations or treatises than any other. To do it full justice would require from me both a new translation and a comment on each verse—a thing inconsistent with the plan of these brief and occasional remarks on the book of Psalms. I can only offer a few remarks. It is of late origin, referring to the return of the Jews from Babylon and the re-establishment of the Kingdom of God on Mount Zion. Hence its analogy with the Deutero-Isaiah. The hope of the people is expressed in a lyric hymn which takes a highly poetical flight, full of bold imagery, and animated with a fiery inspiration. Verse 11. Translate "thy beasts settled down in it; thou preparedst them in thy goodness for the afflicted, O God," with a reference to the quails. The triumphal song of the women announcing victory begins with the 13th verse and ends with the 15th. Verses 14, 15. Translate,

“ Will ye lie at ease between the pales ?
 Wings of a dove covered with silver
 And her feathers with the shimmering yellow of gold,
 When the Almighty scattered kings therein,
 It became clear as snow in the darkness.”

The sense of these words can only be guessed. The first line is addressed to the victorious Israelites by way of rebuke. They take their ease instead of pursuing the enemy. The bold figure in the second and third lines may allude to the still, unwarlike, pastoral life of the two and a half tribes on the east of Jordan who, instead of following up their conquest, rest in contented inactivity, admiring the bright colors of the doves in the fields where the cattle are being herded. The reproof is still continued that the tribes are satisfied with pastoral life when they should be continuing their warlike conduct; and the severe admonition is enforced by the fact that they were thus idly reclining amid the pastures of their flocks, though the Almighty scattered kings for their sake. It is impossible to say what כָּה in the 15th verse refers to. 31. “Rebuke the beast of the reeds, the multitude of bulls with the calves of the peoples; subdue those who are greedy for money,” etc. “The beast of the reeds” means Egypt. Bulls are the strong; calves the weak. The last part requires a slight change of the original text to bring out the sense I have given.

LXIX. This Psalm dates in the exile and proceeds from a prophet, as appears from verses 30–37; but whether Jeremiah can be fixed upon as the writer, which is Hitzig’s opinion, cannot be settled by any probable evidence. The various passages in it which are applied to Christ in the New Testament do not show that the writer had such in his mind; especially as the bitter spirit and curses of enemies (verses 23, etc.) are directly opposed to the genius of the New Testament. The 11th verse. “And I wept; my soul was in fasting” (i. e. I fasted) hardly requires the emendation of Olshausen and Hupfeld, which turns וְאֶכְבֶּה into וְאֶעֱנֶה, “I humbled my soul by fasting.”

LXX. This poem is a repetition of the second part of Psalm XL. The variations of the two texts show on the whole the superiority of the present one.

LXXII. The title ascribes the authorship to Solomon; but he is neither the writer nor the subject of it. The language and contents are much later. It expresses the hopes, wishes, and aspirations of a pious Israelite for the everlasting continuance of the Davidic kingdom, which was regarded as identical with the Kingdom of God; and describes in the ideal language of poetry a king reigning over the whole earth. Such hopes point to a Messianic time. The collector of the second book of the Psalms, thinking that the Davidic ones were ended, added the doxological epilogue contained in the last three verses. Lowe and Jennings render the prefix בַּ in ראשׁ unto, incorrectly (verse 16). It is extremely doubtful whether the preposition has ever that

meaning; though Gesenius and Fürst give it. The passages quoted in its favor are not relevant, such as Genesis xi. 4, Psalm xix. 5. The signification of "motion to" should be dropped.

LXXIII. The 4th verse should be rendered, "their iniquity has gone forth from an unfeeling heart; the imaginations of the heart have overflowed." This requires a change of punctuation in one word. See Fürst's *Lexicon*. The second clause of the 24th verse is wrongly translated in the received version, though Hupfeld agrees with it. Such belief in a future state of happiness is foreign to the Old Testament. It should be translated, "and after honor thou wilt take me," i. e. thou wilt take me to honor. **אחר** is a preposition governing **כבוד**, not an adverb. See "Fresh Revision," pp. 72, 73.

LXXIV. If the text of the 19th verse be right, we must render, "give not over to the greedy troop thy turtle dove" (dear people). By transposing two words Hupfeld gets, "give not over to rage the life of thy dove."

LXXVI. 5. This verse is difficult. Though Ewald, DeWette and others render it, "thou art full of splendor, more excellent than the mountains of prey," I cannot think that the poet would have compared Jehovah to the mountains of prey. It is better to translate "from mountains of prey;" but Hupfeld, who identifies these mountains with Zion, can hardly be correct. A *sacred* place could not be so designated except by a strange figure. I take "mountains of prey" to be a general expression referring to no specific place. Jehovah is represented as a lion descending from mountains to spoil and subdue. The Psalm refers to Sennacherib's overthrow. Verse 11. "Thou girdest thyself with the remnant of fury," i. e. God's fury. *When* should not be supplied before "thou girdest," as DeWette supposes.

LXXVII. 11th verse. This very obscure verse I translate thus: "Then I said, this is my suffering; but the right hand of the Most High changes." The Psalmist's consolation derived from the mighty works which God wrought for his people in past times, follows in the next verse. Among the many interpretations offered, that of Delitzsch is the most far-fetched and improbable. The theophany in verses 17-20 appears to be the insertion of a later hand than the author's. It is borrowed in part from Hab. iii. 10, etc. Delitzsch, however, thinks that it is the original which Habakkuk had before him.

[To be continued.]

A TRACT ON THE SYRIAC CONJUNCTIONS.

BY RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, PH. D.,

Columbia College, New York City.

The native Syriac grammarians usually speak of seven parts of speech. Thus Yûhanân bar Zu'bî says distinctly (MS. Or. Berlin Sachau, 306, fol. 67a):

[illegible]

Severus bar Šakkū, his pupil, makes the same division in the beginning of his *διάλογοι*. The same may be said of Elīā of Tīrhân,² and of Bar 'Ebhṛāyā.³ But there was another division current among the Syriac, Arabic, and Hebrew grammarians.⁴ This was the threefold division into noun, verb, and conjunction. This division is Aristotelian,⁵ and probably owes its existence to the philosophical studies of Syriac and Arabic scholars. The *συνδεσμοί* comprised "all elements of speech which possess no logical worth."⁶ Bar 'Ebhṛāyā, too, though he mentions the other division, makes use of this more common one both in his larger and smaller grammars.

The following little tract on the conjunctions is not uninteresting, and may be useful in tracing back the statements of the native grammarians to their source. The Grecian grammarians had already separated the conjunctions into different classes; the later ones, such as Apollonios, giving to each conjunction its own peculiar power. Bar 'Ebh râyâ has a very instructive chapter on this point in his

‡ I. e., ὄνομα ῥήματος of Appolonios (Steinthal "Gesch. der Sprachwissen., p. 642). Otherwise the plural is *Mellai Sh'emâ* (Bar 'Ebh. i., p. 15, 15). Among Syriac grammarians the "verbal

or impliedly,¹⁰ and others are nouns which in themselves designate actions.^{10a} Gêr, dê(i)n, kîth, lam. Some unite the discourse,¹¹ some the thought. Some introduce the person, and some are disjunctive.¹² And there are some which stand alone.

Gê(i)r brings that which is below (protasis) to that which is above (apodosis).¹³ Gê(i)r, further, is a conjunction of a phrase; and, at times, causes that which is above (apodosis) to follow, and joins it to that which is below (protasis).¹⁴ De(i)n, also, has the same power as gê(i)r, and joins that which is above to that which is below, and that which is below to that which is above.¹⁵ B'ram introduces the person, and keeps it far from doubt in very truth.¹⁶ Kith connects that which has previously been said with the discourse, and binds the discourse, so that what has been mentioned be not strange to that which has preceded.¹⁷ Lam, as is evident to every one, distinguishes the person, and shows that that which has been said does not belong to it.¹⁸ Hâkhîl and Badhghûn are not conjunctions, but are compounded of conjunctions.¹⁹ Badhghûn joins the verb with a noun expressing cause, when it connects the discourse. That one and hâkhîl refer to some narrative.²⁰ Ellâ and b'ram are confirmative.²¹ Kadh is preparatory;²² Madhê(i)n is causative.²³ Kê'math is affirmative.²⁴ Âphen [shows] equality of action.²⁵ Aikanâ teaches something. Aukîth is explanatory. Hâdhê and hânâ affirm that which has been prefaced beforehand. Hâkhanâ [shows] equality and completion. Ân is a word which shows joy.²⁶ Lâ is a word showing contradiction.²⁷ Tûbh [shows] an addition to that which has preceded. 'Emath(i) indicates time. Aikâ indicates place. K'mâ expresses number, and length, and width, and weight, and measure. âra forms an optative sentence and Kai is like it.²⁸ Kaddû, up to this; μάλον especially; ara kai; and badhghûn thence, or therefore. εἶτα afterwards. B'ram is placed sometimes instead of hâššâ, sometimes instead of ellâ; τὰκῃ perhaps.

NOTES.

¹ cf. *Mufasssal*, ed. Broch, p. ۱۳. الحرف ما دل على معنى في غيره which corresponds to the definition in the Poetics of Aristotle (1457a) σύνδεσμος δέ ἐστι φωνῇ ἄσημος. Cf. also *Ignazio Guidi* "Bolletino Italiano degli studii orientali," Nuova Serie.—Num. 6, p. 108. There was, however, another definition current among the Syrian grammarians. On fol. 60a. Bar Zu'bi says:

noun" had a very wide signification, any form of the verb with either the prefix Dâlath or Lâmadh being classed under that head. Bar Zu'bi (fol. 53a), has a statement to this effect which is too long to cite here. Cf. *Elia of Tîrhan*, p. 39, 10. *Bar 'Ebhîrâya* i., p. 81, 16 (= Karmseddin Ap. *Payne Smith*, Col. 2113). Cf. also the τοῦ ἀναγινώσκειν and ἀναγνώσκειν of Priscian (*Steinthal*, p. 645). An expression similar to the one in our text occurs in *Bar 'Ebhîrâya* i., p. 81, 22, though we would expect here the words dh^emellê w^edhash^emâhê (*Bar 'Ebh.* i., p. 156, 6; ii., ed., Bertheau, p. 65; *Elia of Tîrhan*, p. 39, 17).

NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S ARTIFICIAL RESERVOIR.

BY HUGO WINCKLER, PH. D.,

Berlin, Germany.

In a previous number of *HEBRAICA*¹ I called attention to an old structure, the tunnel of Negub, by means of a partial restoration of an inscription, which had been previously given up as hopelessly mutilated. This time I should like to call attention to a similar undertaking, one of which we now have many proofs. The first decipherer (Oppert) of the great Nebuchadnezzar inscription in the East India House, London, has already pointed out that one passage agrees exactly with a notice of Berossus. I R. 58, VIII. 52—IX. 1 we read :

i-na bi-i-ri-šu-nu bi-ti-iḫ a-gur-ri i-ib-
ti-iḫ ma i-na ri-i-ši-šu ku-um-mu ra-ba-a
a-na šu-ba-at šar-ru-ti-ia i-na ku-up-ri u
a-gur-ri ša-ki-iš i-bu-uš ma it-ti škal abî
u-rad-di ma in arḫi ša-al-mu i-na ūmu
šîmu i-ra-sa i-na i-ra-at ki-gal-lu u-ša-
ar-ši-id ma ri-i-ši-ša u-za-aḫ-qi-ir ḫu-ur-
sa-ni-iš i-na XV. ū-mu ši-bi-ir-ša u-ša-
ak-li-il ma

In between (*i. e.*, the walls) I erected
a mole of brick. On its top I built a
large building for my royal residence
and joined it to the palace of my father²
In a lucky month, on an auspicious day,
“I joined its breast to the breast of the
nether world,”³ and elevated its top
like a mountain forest. In 15 days I
finished its building.

The corresponding passage in Berossus (Abydenus ap. Eusebius Chron. ed. Schoene, p. 38) reads as follows : “When Nebuchadnezzar had received the royal power, he surrounded Babylon with a triple wall in 15 days. He drew off the Nahr-malka, an arm of the Euphrates. Above the city Sippara he built a reservoir, 40 parasangs in circumference, and 20 fathoms deep, and built gates which could be opened so as to irrigate the plain. It was called *ὑπερογώμους*.”

We pass over the rapidity with which the building is said to have been constructed. It is sufficient to call attention to the wonderful way in which the words of Nebuchadnezzar agree with those of Berossus.

The cuneiform inscriptions give us also information about the triple walls. The two principal walls, Imgur-Bil and Nimitti-Bil, are frequently mentioned ; and I myself have published a text in the *Ztschrift. f. d. Assyriologie*, I., p. 337, sqq. (cf. also *ibid.* II., p. 124, sqq.) relating to the building of the third outer wall. It has not been possible, up to the present time, to identify the works on the Nahr-

¹ October, 1887, p. 52.

³ I layed the foundation.

² Or i-kal-at (?) : to the (before mentioned) temples ?

malka and the building of the reservoir. But it is evident that these works are likewise mentioned in the inscription of Nabopolassar published by me in the *Ztschrift. f. d. Assyriologie*, II., p. 69, sqq. In my notes to this inscription (*ibid.* p. 75) I have already made the conjecture that, by the *mí nuḥši niklûti* there mentioned, the reservoirs mentioned by Rassam, *Babylonian Cities*, Victoria Institute, p. 5,¹ London, are meant. This conjecture is verified by the passage in Berossus mentioned above. The works were used for collecting the water for the irrigation of the land, for which the Babylonian expression *mí nuḥši* "water of fruitfulness" very well fits. The fact that in one place the buildings are ascribed to Nabopolassar, in the other to his son Nebuchadnezzar presents no difficulties. Either a mistake has been made by one of the many editors of Berossus (Abydenus), or this work, like so many others, was begun by Nabopolassar, and only finished by his son. Whether we have, as I conjectured (*loc. cit.* p. 70) any information in this same inscription about buildings erected on the Nahr-Malka, and mentioned also by Berossus, cannot yet with certainty be decided. In both cases the expression is not quite clear.

As I think I can further the understanding of that inscription a little, I allow the passage I have mentioned to follow (Nabop. I. 4—II. 8).

| | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| 14. nâru Purattu is-si-šu-ma | The Euphrates had left it (Sippara). |
| 15. a-na ku-ud(?)—dul ² bi-lu-ti-šu-nu | to... ..its greatness |
| 16. mi-í i-ri-í-ku a-na ³ sa-a-bu | the waters had departed to (from?).. |
| II. 1. Na-bi-um-abil-u-ṣu-ur | Nabopolassar, |
| 2. a-aš-ru ša-aḥ-tim | the humble, the submissive, |
| 3. pa-li-iḥ ilī ia-a-ti | worshiper of the gods |
| 4. nâr Sippara | caused the canal of Sippara |
| 5. lu-u-ša-aḥ-ra-am-ma | to be dug. |
| 6. mi-í nu-uḥ-ši nik-lu-tim | An artificial reservoir |
| 7. a-na Šamaš bīli-ia | for Šamaš my master, |
| 8. lu-u-ki-in | I constructed. |

It is worthy of note how exactly the name given to the reservoir, *mí nuḥši*, "waters of abundance, of fruitfulness," agrees with the statement made by Berossus-Abydenus that its purpose was "to irrigate the plain."

¹"Remains of prodigious basins are seen, in which a surplus supply must have been kept for any emergency when the water in the Euphrates falls low."

²Not *ku*!

³cf. ZA. II. 145.

OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES MESSIANICALLY APPLIED BY THE ANCIENT SYNAGOGUE.

BY REV. B. PICK, PH. D.,

Allegheny City, Pa.

VI.

JEREMIAH.

V. 9. "And it shall come to pass, when ye shall say, Wherefore doeth the Lord our God all these things?" etc.

Rabbi Jose, the son of Halaphta, said: Whoever knows how many years the Israelites served idols, will know when the Son of David comes. And these three passages are in support of this dictum, viz.: "And I will visit upon her the days of Baalim, wherein she burned incense to them" (Hos. II. 13); "That as he cried, and they would not hear; so they cried, and I would not hear" (Zech. VII. 13); and "It shall come to pass, when," etc.—*Introduction to Midrash on Lamentations*.

XVI. 13. See under Gen. XLIX. 10.

XXIII. 5. "I will raise unto David a righteous branch."

Targum: I will raise unto David the Messiah the righteous.

— 6. "And this is his name whereby he shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness."

Rabbi Samuel, the son of Nachman, said, in the name of Rabbi Jonathan: Three are called by the name of the Holy One, blessed be he! viz.: the righteous, Messiah, and Jerusalem. Of the righteous it is said, "Everyone that is called by my name" (Isa. XLIII. 7). Of Messiah it is said, "This is his name," etc.; and of Jerusalem it is written, "And the name of the city from that day shall be, the Lord is there" (Ezek. XLVIII. 35). Read not "there" (šāmāh), but "her name" (š'māh).—*Talmud Baba Bathra*, fol. 75, col. 2; *Yalkut* in loco.

What is the name of the King Messiah? Rabbi Abba, son of Kahana, said: Jehovah; for it is written, "This is his name whereby he shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness." Rabbi Levi said: Blessed is the city whose name is like the name of its king, and the name of its king like the name of his God. Blessed is the city whose name is like the name of its king; because it is written, "And the name of the city from that day shall be, Jehovah is there" (Ezek. XLVIII. 35); and the name of its king like the name of its God; for it is written, "And this is his name whereby," etc. Rabbi Joshua, son of

Levi, said: "Branch" (ḡémāḥ) is the Messiah's name; for it is written, "Behold, the man whose name is Branch, and he shall grow out of his place." Rabbi Judan said, in the name of Rabbi Ibo: "Comforter" (m'nāḥēm) is his name; for it is written, "The Comforter is far from me" (Lam. i. 16). Rabbi Hanina replied: There is no contradiction in the assertions of both; for ḡémāḥ and m'nāḥēm are equal in number.—*Midrash on Lamentations* i. 16.

— 7, 8. "The days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, The Lord liveth which brought up and which led," etc.

Ben-Zoma asked the wise men: Will mention be made of the Egyptian exodus in the days of the Messiah? Is it not said, "The days come, saith the Lord," etc.? They replied: The Egyptian exodus will not lose its place altogether, but will only become secondary, in view of the liberation from the subjection to the other Gentile kingdoms.—*Talmud Berachoth*, fol. 12, col. 2.

XXX. 9. "But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them."

Targum: And they shall worship before the Lord their God, and they shall hearken to Messiah the Son of David, their king, whom I will raise up to them.

Rav said: In the future God will raise up for them another David; as it is said, "They shall serve the Lord their God," etc.—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 98, col. 2.

— 21. "And their governor shall proceed from the midst of them."

Targum: And their kings shall be magnified from them, and their Messiah shall appear out of their midst.

XXXI. 20. See under Ps. xxii. 7.

XXXIII. 13. "The flocks shall pass again under the hands of him that telleth them."

Targum: The people shall be again numbered by the hand of the Messiah.

— 15. "I will cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David."

Targum: I will raise up unto David the Messiah of righteousness.

LAMENTATIONS.

I. 16. "For these things I weep; mine eye, mine eye runneth down with water, because the comforter that should relieve my soul is far from me," etc.

See under Gen. xlix. 10. The Midrash in loco gives a curious story about the birth of the Messiah, which is the same as quoted from the Jerusalem Talmud under Ps. xviii. 50.

II. 22. "Thou hast called as in a solemn day my terrors round about."

Targum: Thou shalt proclaim freedom to thy people of the house of Israel, by the hand of the Messiah.

- IV. 22. "The punishment of thine iniquity is accomplished, O daughter of Zion."
Targum: And afterwards the iniquity shall be finished, O congregation of Zion, and thou shalt be delivered by the hands of the Messiah and Elijah the high priest.

EZEKIEL.

- XVI. 55. "When thy sisters, Sodom and her daughters, shall return to their former estate."

There are ten things which will be renewed in the future. The fourth is, All devastated cities will be rebuilt, and there shall be no more any desolated place; even Sodom and Gomorrah will once be rebuilt, as it is said, "When thy sisters, Sodom," etc.—*Midrash on Exodus* XII. 12, sect. 15.

- XXV. 14. "And I will lay my vengeance upon Edom by the hand of my people Israel."

In this life, it is true, the Israelites are compared to the dust of the earth; but in the Messianic age they will be like the sand of the sea; for as the sand makes the teeth dull, so also will the heathen be destroyed in the time of the Messiah, as it is said, "There shall come a star out of Israel" (Num. XXIV. 17), and "I will lay my vengeance," etc.—*Midrash on Numbers* II. 32, sect. 2.

- XXXI. 21. "In that day will I cause the horn of the house of Israel to bud forth."

Rav Hanina said: The Son of David will not come till fish will not be found even when required for a sick man; for it is said, "Then will I cause their waters to sink, and their rivers to run like oil" (Ezek. XXXII. 14), and it is also written, "In that day will I cause the horn of the house," etc.—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 98, col. 1.

- XLVII. 9. "And it shall come to pass, that everything that liveth, which moveth, whithersoever the rivers shall come, shall live."

Of the ten new things which will be in the future the second is, the Holy One will bring forth living water from Jerusalem, and will cure with it all diseases, as it is said, "And it shall come to pass," etc.—*Midrash on Exodus* XII. 12, sect. 15.

- 12. "And by the river upon the bank thereof, on this side and on that side, shall grow all trees for meat, whose leaf shall not fade, neither shall the fruit thereof be consumed; it shall bring forth new fruit according to his month, because their waters they issued out of the sanctuary."

The third of the ten new things which will be in future is that the Holy One makes the trees bring forth fruits every month, as it is said, "And by the river upon," etc.—*Midrash*, l. c.

- XLVIII. 19. "And they that serve the city shall serve it out of all the tribes of Israel."

Mar says: The Land of Israel is in the future to be divided among thirteen tribes. To whom (belongs the thirteenth part)? To the Prince (i. e., the

King Messiah, as Rashi explains); for it is written, "And they that serve," etc.—*Talmud Baba Bathra*, fol. 122, col. 1.

DANIEL.

II. 22. "And the light dwelleth with him."

Abba Serungia refers these words to the Messiah; for it is said, "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee" (Isa. LX. 1).—*Midrash on Genesis* I. 1, sect. 1.

Rabbi Bibi Sanguria said: Light is his (Messiah's) name; for it is said, "The light dwelleth with him."—*Midrash on Lamentations* I. 16.

VII. 9. "I beheld till the thrones were placed (not 'cast down,' as in A. V.), and the Ancient of days did sit."

What will this say? One (throne) for himself and one for David. For we have the teaching: One for himself and for David,—these are the words of Rabbi Akiva. Said to him Rabbi Jose: Akiva! how long wilt thou render the Shechinah profane!—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 38, col. 2; *Hagigah*, fol. 14, col. 1.

— 13. "Behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven."

Rabbi Joshua ben Levi asked: In one place it is written, "Behold, one like the Son of Man," etc., and in another, "Lowly and riding upon an ass!" (Zech. ix. 9). (He answered), If they be worthy, He (the Messiah) will come with the clouds of heaven; if not, He will come lowly and riding upon an ass.¹—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 98, col. 1.

— 27. "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven," etc.

Because the Israelites observed the law among them (the Edomites), the Holy One will make them inherit in the future the throne of glory; as it is said, "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness," etc.—*Midrash on Numbers* VI. 22, sect. 11.

IX. 24. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city," etc.

¹ Very interesting is the following interpretation given by Saadia (flourished in the ninth century) on the passage: "This (one like the Son of Man) is Messiah our righteousness; for it is not written with reference to Messiah, 'lowly, and riding upon an ass'? (Zech. ix. 9); surely he comes in humility, for he does not come upon a horse in glory. But since it is written, 'with the clouds of heaven,' it signifies the angels of the heavenly hosts, which is the great glory which the Creator will give to the Messiah, as it is written, 'with the clouds of heaven;' then he shall be great in government. When it is said (v. 9), 'the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool,' he speaks after the manner of men. They brought him to the Ancient of days; for it is written (Ps. cx. 1), 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand,' etc. 'And there was given him dominion,' i. e., He gave to him a government and a kingdom, as it is written (Ps. ii. 6), 'Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion;' and as it is written (1 Sam. ii. 10), 'He shall exalt the horn of his anointed; his kingdom shall not depart, and shall not be destroyed for ever and ever.'"

True, it was known that the temple will be destroyed; but the time could not be fixed. Abai said, This cannot be determined; but against this is the passage, "Seventy weeks," etc.—*Talmud Nazir*, fol. 32, col. 2.

Rabbi Jose said: Seventy weeks intervened between the destruction of the first temple and the second.—*Yalkut on Amos* VII. 17.

XII. 3. See Isaiah LIV. 5.

— 11, 12. See Ruth II. 14.

HOSEA.

II. 13. See Jer. v. 19.

— 18. "And in that day will I make a covenant for them with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven, and with the creeping things of the ground."

To the ten new things which will be in the future belongs, 7) that the Holy One will bring together all beasts, all fowls and creeping things, and will make a covenant with them and with all Israel; as it is said, "And in that day will I make a covenant," etc.—*Midrash on Numbers* XII. 12, sect. 15.

III. 5. "Afterwards shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king."

Targum: Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the service of the Lord their God, and be obedient to Messiah the Son of David, their king.

XIV. 7. "They that dwell under his shadow shall return."

Targum: They shall dwell under the shadow of their Messiah.

JOEL.

II. 28. "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh," etc.

God said: In this world only a few prophesy; but in the future all Israelites will be prophets, as it is said, "And it shall come to pass afterward," etc.—*Midrash on Numbers* XI. 16, sect. 15.

IV. 18. "And a fountain shall come forth of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Shittim."

As the first redeemer (i. e., Moses) caused a spring to come up, so also will the last do; as it is said, "And a fountain shall come forth," etc.—*Midrash on Ecclesiastes* I. 9.

AMOS.

IV. 7. "And I caused it to rain upon one city, and caused it not to rain upon another city."

The rabbis have taught: In the cycle of seven years in which the Son of David shall come, in the first year this scripture will be fulfilled, "And I will

cause it to rain upon one city, and cause it not to rain upon another city;" in the second the arrows of famine shall be sent; in the third there shall be a great famine, and men and women, pious people and men of deed, shall die, and the law shall be forgotten by those who have studied it; in the fourth shall be satiety, but it shall not be satiety; in the fifth shall be great satiety, and they shall eat and drink, and rejoice, and the law shall return to those who had learned; in the sixth, uproar; in the seventh, wars; in the end of the seventh the Son of David will come. Behold, exclaimed Rav Joseph, there have been many septennial cycles of this kind, and Messiah has not come. Abaye replied: Were there voices in the sixth year, and wars in the seventh? or did the events occur in the same order?—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 97, col. 1.¹

V. 18. "Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! to what end is it for you? the day of the Lord is darkness, and not light."

Rabbi Sintär lectured: What is the meaning of what is written, "Woe unto you that desire the day," etc. It is to be compared to a cock and a bat which were once waiting for the light, when the cock said to the bat, "I wait for the light, because the light is intended for me, but thou, what is the light to thee?" And this is similar to what Rabbi Abuhu answered a certain Sadducee, who had asked when Messiah will come: "When darkness will overwhelm your people," was the reply.—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 98, col. 2.

VIII. 11. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, or a thirst for water, but of hearing the word of the Lord."

Ten famines came into the world; the first was in the days of the first man, for it is said: "cursed is the ground for thy sake" (Gen. III. 14); the second in the days of Lamech, for it is said "because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed" (Gen. v. 29); the third in the days of Abraham (Gen. XII. 10); the fourth in the days of Isaac (XXVI. 1); the fifth in Jacob's time (XLV. 6); the sixth in the time of the Judges (Ruth I. 1); the seventh in the days of David (2 Sam. XXI. 1); the eighth in the days of Elisha (2 Kgs. VI. 28); the tenth will be in the future, as it is said, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine," etc.—*Midrash on Genesis*, v. 29, sect. 25.

IX. 11. "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen."

Rav Nachman said to Rav Isaac: Hast thou heard when the son of the fallen come? Who is the Son of the Fallen? [Reply.] Messiah. Is the Messiah called the Son of the Fallen? Yes. For it is written, "In that day will I raise," etc. Well, replied Rav Isaac, thus said Rabbi Jochanan: In the generation when the son of David will come, the disciples of the wise will

¹ The same we also find in *Midrash on Song of Solomon*, II. 13.

be diminished, the eyes of those that shall be left shall be consumed with grief and anguish, and many calamities and oppressive edicts will be repeatedly decreed, so that before one visitation ceases a second will come on speedily.—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 96, col. 2; 97 col. 1; *Yalkut on Amos* XI. 11. After enumerating the unexpected deliverance of Joseph, Moses, Ruth, David, of Israel in the days of Haman, the Midrash continues: Who could have expected that the Holy One, blessed be He! would raise up the fallen tabernacle of David, as it is said, "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen," (and who should have expected) that the whole world should become one congregation? Yet it is said, "for thee will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent" (*Zeph. III. 9*).—*Midrash on Genesis*, XL. 23; sect. 88.

OBADIAH.

18. "And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau for stubble, and they shall kindle in them."

The Israelites said before God: Lord of the Universe! how long shall we be in bondage? He replied: Till the day comes of which it is said, There shall come a star of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel" (*Num. XXIV. 12*). As soon as the star comes of Jacob, the stubble of Esau will burn. How is this proved? From "And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame," etc. God said: In that hour my kingdom will be glorious and I will rule over you, as it is said, "And saviors shall come up on Mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau, and the kingdom shall be the Lord's" (*Obad. 21*).—*Midrash on Deuteronomy*, II. 4, sect. 1.

MICAH.

- IV. 3. "Nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Rabbi Elieser said: In the time of the Messiah, will not be found any arms, because they will not be needed, for it is said "Nation shall not lift up a sword," etc.—*Talmud Shabbath*, fol. 63, col. 1.

- 8. "And thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come."

Targum: And thou, O Messiah of Israel, who art hidden by reason of the sins of the congregation of Zion, to thee hereafter is the kingdom to come.

- V. 2. "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be a ruler in Israel."

Targum: But thou, Bethlehem-Ephratah, thou hast been little to be counted among the thousands of the house of Judah, yet out of thee shall come forth

before me Messiah, to exercise dominion over Israel, whose name is spoken of from old, from the days of eternity.

- 3. “Therefore will He give them up, until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth: then the remnant of his brethren shall return unto the children of Israel.”

Rav said: The Son of David will not come until the ungodly kingdom has spread itself for a period of nine months over Israel,¹ for it is said, “Therefore will He give them up,” etc.—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 98, col. 2.

- 5. “And this man shall be the peace, when the Assyrian shall come into our land; and when he shall tread in our palaces, then shall we raise against him shepherds, and eight principal men.”

Rabbi Simeon, the son of Yochai, has taught: When you see a Persian horse tied to the graves of the land of Israel, expect the footsteps of the Messiah. What is the reason? “And this man shall be the peace,” etc. And who are the seven shepherds? In the midst is David, Adam, Seth, Methuselah to his right, and Abraham, Jacob and Moses to his left. And where went Isaac? He went and sat down at the gate of hell, to save his children from the judgment of hell, and the eight principal men are: Jesse, Saul, Samuel, Amos, Zephaniah, Hezekiah, Elijah and the King Messiah.—*Midrash on Song of Solomon*, VIII. 10.

- VII, 6. “For the son dishonoureth the father, the daughter riseth up against her mother, the daughter in law against her mother in law; a man’s enemies are the men of his own house.”

Rabbi Nehorai said: In the generation in which the Son of David will come, boys will confuse the faces of old men. Old men will rise up before the young. The son will treat the father shamefully,² and the daughter will rise up against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. The face of that generation will be as the face of a dog; the son will have no shame before his father.—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 97, col. 1.

In the footprints of the Messiah impudence will increase, and there will be scarcity. The vine will produce its fruit, but wine will be dear, and the government will turn itself to heresy, and there will be no reproof. And the house of assembly will be for fornication. Galilee will be destroyed, and Gablas laid waste; and the men of Gabul will go from city to city and find no favor. And the wisdom of scribes will stink, and those that fear sin will be despised, and truth will fail. Boys will confuse the faces of old men. Old men will rise up before the young. The son will treat the father shamefully, the daughter will rise up against her mother; the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, and a man’s foes will be those of his own household. The

¹ *Talmud Yoma*, fol. 10, col. 1, read for “over Israel,” over the whole world.

² The same we find in *Midrash on Song of Solomon*, 2, 13.

face of that generation will be as the face of a dog; the son will have no shame before his father. Upon whom, then, are we to rely? Upon our Father who is in heaven.—*Talmud Sotah*, fol. 49, col. 2.

NAHUM.

- I. 15. "Behold upon the mountains the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace! O Judah, keep thy solemn feasts," etc.

When the evangelist will come once, Judah will be the first to hear the good tidings, as it is said, "Behold upon the mountains," etc.—*Midrash on Numbers*, II. 9; sect. 2.

HABAĠKUK.

- II. 3. See Isa. xxx. 18.

- III. 18. "Yet I will rejoice in the Lord."

Targum: Then on account of the miracles and deliverance that thou shalt perform for thy Messiah.

ZEPHANIAH.

- III. 9. "For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent."

Rabbi Eliezer said: In the future, all Gentiles will be converts, which, as Rabbi Joseph said, is proved, "for then will I turn to the people a pure language," etc.—*Talmud Aboda Zarah*, fol. 24, col. 1.

- 11. "For then I will take away out of the midst of thee them that rejoice in thy pride, and thou shalt no more be haughty because of my holy mountain." Seiri said, in the name of Rabbi Hanina: The Son of David will not come till all pride has ceased in Israel, for it is said, "For then I will take away," etc. And it is also written, "I will also leave in the midst of thee an afflicted and poor people, and they shall trust in the name of the Lord" (v. 12).—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 98, col. 1.

HAGGAI.

- II. 6. "Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land."

"Behold I have begun." This refers, said Rabbi Azarya, to the help which is once to come. How so? As the prophet said to Israel, "Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens," etc.—*Midrash on Deuteronomy*, II. 31; sect. 1.

ZECHARIAH.

- I. 20. "And the Lord showed me four carpenters."

Who are these four carpenters? Rav Chana the son of Bisna said, in the name of Rabbi Simon the Pious: They were Messiah the son of David, Messiah

the son of Joseph, Elijah, and the Angel of Righteousness.—*Talmud Suah*, fol. 52, col. 2; *Yalkut* in *Exod.*

II. 10. See below under *ix.* 9.

III. 8. "I will bring forth my servant, the Branch."

Targum: Behold! I bring my servant the Messiah, who shall be revealed.

IV. 7. "The head-stone thereof."

Targum: And he shall reveal his Messiah, whose name was spoken from eternity. "Who art thou, O great mountain? before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain." This is the king Messiah. And why is he called the great mountain? Because he is greater than the patriarchs.—*Tanhuma in Yalkut* in loco.

VI. 12. "And speak unto him, saying, Thus speaketh the Lord of Hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the Branch, and he shall grow up out of his place," etc.

Targum: And thou shalt speak to him, saying, Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, saying, Behold the man, Messiah is his name, who shall hereafter be revealed and anointed.

— See above *Jer.* *xxiii.* 6.

VII. 13. See above *Jer.* *v.* 19.

IX. 1. "The burden of the word of the Lord in the land of Hadrach, and Damascus shall be the rest thereof."

What is the meaning of the word Hadrach? According to Rabbi Judah it is the name of a place. According to Rabbi Nehemiah, Hadrach is the name of the king, Messiah, because he is sharp (*kad*) and gentle (*rach*); sharp to the Gentiles and soft to the Israelites.—*Midrash on the Song of Solomon* *vii.* 5; *Yalkut* in loco.

➤CONTRIBUTED NOTES.◀

The Native Language of Abraham.—It would be reasonable to infer that the native language of Abraham was Aramaic, since he emigrated from Ur of the Chaldees to the land of Canaan (Gen. xi. 31). Moreover, in Deut. xxvi. 5, where directions are given for the offering of the first-fruits, reference is made to Abraham as the Syrian. Also the word Hebrew, which is applied first to Abraham (Abram), Gen. xiv. 13, points in the same direction. *Hebrew* means the one from beyond, i. e., beyond the Euphrates. It is a patronymic from עֵבֶר *the country beyond*, עֵבֶר הַנָּהָר *the country beyond the river*. The appellative would then mean *the one who comes from beyond* (the river). It is so translated in the Septuagint ὁ περάτης. The conclusive argument, however, is to be taken from Gen. xxxi., according to which Jacob and Laban made a heap of stones, commemorative of their covenant. Jacob gave it a Hebrew name, Galeed, גַּלְעָד, *heap of witness*, but Laban called it Jegarshahadutha יִגְרָשָׁהדוּתָא, which has the same meaning as Galeed. This compound Jegarshahadutha is Aramaic. The only reason why Laban would use Aramaic, would be because it was his own language and that of the country in which he lived.

The grandfather of Laban was Nahor, and of Jacob, Abraham. Nahor and Abraham were brothers, the sons of Terah, Gen. xi. 27. When Terah went out from Ur, he took with him Abram and his grandson Lot, whose father, Haran, had died. He left behind Nahor, his second son, the father of Bethuel and grandfather of Laban. Those that remained in their own country would not change their language, and since Laban spoke Aramaic that must have been originally the language of Terah and his family. It is probable that Abraham knew Hebrew before he came into the land of Canaan, for there is no indication that he had any difficulty in conversing with its inhabitants.

W. O. SPROULL,
University of Cincinnati.

Two Corrections.—I have to make two corrections in my article in the July number of *HEBRAICA*, to which Professor Nöldeke has kindly called my attention. On page 250, line 4, ^٥خَب is the Greek ἐδόξα *he was of opinion*. For ^٥حَص = δόξα, see Hoffmann "De Hermeneuticis apud Syros Aristoteleis," p. 211, 24. We have the same use of the word in ^٥حَص = ἐρθόδοξος. Wright, "Catalogue of Syriac MSS.," p. 494a, 599, l. 5.; Frothingham, "Stephen bar Sudaili," p. 59. Bar 'Alî, No. 1546. Knös "Chrestomathia," p. 7, 8, etc.

Professor Nöldeke also thinks it probable that Bar 'Ebhryâ has made Thales to be his own countryman, as ^٥البلطي ("Hist. Dynast.," p. 50) can also be the Nisba of مَلْطِيَّة = Μελετηνή ("Yâkût," s. v.). In this way the two texts would agree.

RICHARD GOTTHEIL,
Columbia College, N. Y.

➤BOOK :NOTICES.◀

TELONI'S CHRESTOMAZIA ASSIRA.*

This chrestomathy is modeled after Lyon's *Assyrian Manual*. After a short introduction of 11 pp., the author gives in pp. 14-19 the most common Assyrian signs with their most usual values. In this *Sillibario*, the order followed is that of Lyon rather than that of Friedrich Delitzsch. The author has also, after Lyon, separated the phonetic from the ideographic values, the latter appearing on pp. 113-121. Much can be said in favor of this, but, on the whole, the old method seems to be preferable. It enables the student to have before him in one table both values, and, as only the most common ideograms appear in an elementary book of this kind, there is no danger of confusion. The grammar proper extends over pp. 20-50. It is very elementary—in fact, rather too brief and elementary even for a beginner's manual. In the paradigms of the verb, the author follows neither Delitzsch's nor Lyon's nomenclature, e. g., *ikašad* is Pres., *ikšud*, Impf., etc. Pages 50-76 contain Assyrian texts, the most of which are accompanied by a transliteration. The texts used are rather stale, as they have appeared in every elementary Assyrian book which has ever been published. The author's method of transliteration is that of Schrader. With few exceptions the texts are published correctly and very little fault can be found with the transliterations. Pages 77-112 form a commentary to the preceding texts and transliterations, and on pp. 121-144 is given a list of all the words occurring in those texts. The commentary is the chief feature of the book. The method pursued is to be commended highly. The author introduces the pupil at once into Assyrian bibliography, and gives him an insight into the only true method of studying Assyrian. After a careful study of these notes, the student must be well versed in the literature, as constant reference has been made to everything of importance which has ever been published.

The book is printed from photo-engraved plates and is very legible, although the author's writing is not as clear as that of Delitzsch or Pinches.

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER,
Yale University.

DELITZSCH'S GENESIS.†

The venerable author of this excellent work has for decades occupied a position among Old Testament specialists as unique as it has been prominent. In him are found harmoniously united two characteristics that on the surface some-

* CHRESTOMAZIA ASSIRA con paradigmi grammaticali compilata dal Dott. Bruto Teleni, Lib. Doc. di Assiriologia nel R. Istituto di Studi Superiori. Pubblicazioni della Società Asiatica Italiana. Volume I. Firenze: Libreria di Ermanno Loescher. 1887. pp. IV, 144. Prezzo, per i non Soci, Lire 10.

* NEUER COMMENTAR UEBER DIE GENESIS, von Franz Delitzsch. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1887.

times appear inconsistent with each other. And herein the man and his work exhibit their individuality and independence. There are none, among modern commentators, who more profoundly than Delitzsch accept the revealed character of the sacred records, admit and hold fast to that which is supernatural in both the contents of these records and also their inspiration, as over against the naturalistic tendencies of the philosophic thought of the day, which have gained such controlling power in the revolutionary hypothesis of the advanced Old Testament critics; and, on the other hand, there are none who admit more readily than he that, from the human side, these records, as literary compositions that were developed under historical circumstances, that "have had their fates" like other productions of the pen, are the legitimate subjects of historical criticism. It is his stand-point that the application of the current canons of literary criticism to the books of the Bible not only do not injure their character as a revelation and the records of a revelation, but rather enhance these, by exhibiting the origin and growth of these books in their entire historical surroundings and thus enabling the student to draw from them all the better the wealth of truth that was originally deposited in them. The commentaries of Delitzsch, and especially his exposition of Genesis, are exhibitions of these principles put into practice. While it is not always clear to the reader how the writer can adhere to the tenets of the one without violating the rights of the other principle, certain it is, that Delitzsch nearly always succeeds in drawing from the biblical books the pure and wholesome truths of divine revelation.

These facts also explain the fundamental thoughts underlying the method and spirit of the new commentary on Genesis. Naturally Old Testament students will be most interested in the author's position on the problems of Higher Criticism. The book before us is really the fifth edition of the commentary which in 1872 appeared for the fourth time. The changes and improvements are, however, so many and so great, that the author is justified in calling it not the fifth edition of a former work, but "a new commentary." These last fifteen years have witnessed a revolution in the literary criticism of the Old Testament. The old theory of the "supplement," which the Jehovist was thought to have been for the Elohist, is entirely abandoned, thanks to the searching investigations of Hupfeld. A sure basis for critical analysis of the Pentateuch has been made by the theory that the documents of the present Pentateuch were originally separate and independent productions, prepared at different stages in the history of Israel's religious development, which stages they too reflect directly and indirectly, and that these documents were later united into one work. From this stand-point the literary researches of the Pentateuch have been progressing with marked agreement up to the stage which the historical questions of the order of the documents and the historico-theological question of the restatement of the religious factors and forces that entered into and directed Israel's religion in origin and development, have reached.

The older editions of this work were prepared under the spell of the supplementary theory. That Delitzsch, too, had abandoned this, was known from various essays in theological periodicals. Now he has formulated them and given a summary of his views of the origin of the Pentateuch as these have crystallized in his mind after fully a half-century's patient and pious study. He, of course, accepts the ordinary analysis of the Pentateuch, and this is declared by the Germans to be the outcome and fruit of a century's close, critical scrutiny. In the

minor details of the analysis, where not all are yet agreed, he generally sides with Dillmann, in the analysis given in Knobel's Commentary on the Hexateuch. Delitzsch, too, regards the Priest-Codex as the latest and no longer as the earliest document in the Pentateuch, but differs widely from the radical school in claiming for it a pre-exilic origin. In general he looks with horror upon the naturalistic reconstruction schemes of the Wellhausen-Kuenen school. He tersely says that he does not believe in "the religion of the era of Darwin;" i. e., he is not willing to analyze God out of his word and out of the history of Israel and substitute the idea of natural development. It would be a serious misconception of Delitzsch's position to think that he does not accept as historical the contents of the Pentateuch because he places at a later date their literary composition. While he makes concessions in this regard that conservative scholars, particularly in America, are not willing to make, he yet regards as divinely conducted and inspired the history and the records of these books. Nothing is more fixed in his mind than that the book whose thoughts he is unfolding is the word of God. He may have peculiar ideas as to the manner in which these thoughts received the literary shape in which they are now found, but for him this does not affect the revealed character of the thoughts.

Concerning the details of the comments probably little needs to be said. Delitzsch's methods in this regard are well known. With the ardor of youth the aged nestor has collected from the rich storehouses of special research whatever is of any aid in interpreting the words of the book of Genesis. With the experienced scholarship of one who has taught for years, he has sifted the material carefully and retained only that which is of positive value. Whatever historical, philological, archæological, and other investigation, especially Assyriology, has offered has been carefully weighed, although in Assyriology he is willing to accept as reliable what many others regard as at best problematic. A specially valuable feature of the work is that its materials are collected chiefly from primary sources of information and not from secondary, thus opening a field of study to which even Dillmann is an insufficient introduction; and, further, that this material is offered in such a shape as to urge on the student to further study. Of course the commentary in this way contains much that, strictly speaking, might have been excluded as having but little direct bearing on the interpretation proper of the text, but the student can well afford to take this superabundance of good things.

In short, the new commentary is the fruit of long and ripe scholarship. It is the fruit of a life's work. Its merits entitle it to the warmest welcome, and its careful study cannot but be exceedingly profitable.

GEORGE H. SCHODDE,
Capital University.

A TARGŪM CHRESTOMATHY.*

The critical study of the Bible, and especially of the Massoretic text, has of late brought the old versions into great prominence. It has been found that only by means of a careful and critical use of these versions, as Cornill has

* CHRESTOMATHIA TARGUMICA quam collatis libris manu scriptis antiquissimis Tiberiensibus editionibusque impressis celeberrimis ad codices vocalibus Babylonieis instructos edidit adnotatione critica et glossario instruxit Adalbertus Merx. Porta Linguarum Orientalium, Pars VIII. Berlin, H. Reuther, 1888.

done for Ezekiel, can we control the Hebrew text which has come down to us. One of the most important of these, representing as it does one stage in the history of the biblical text, is the Targûm. Many difficulties, however, have stood in the way of a proper use of this ancient witness. Chief among these has been the unscientific state of these texts in our common editions. Teachers who have attempted to make their study a part of a college or seminary course, know the many difficulties which impede their way. The oldest editions, based, it is true, upon some MS. authority, though not always the best, have become as scarce as the MSS. themselves. The same holds good of the Polyglotts, which, in addition, are too unwieldy for general use. Until recently we have had to rely upon the texts printed in many of the Hebrew Bibles, which are either carelessly edited, or corrected according to some peculiar system.*

The German Oriental Society, at its meeting at Breslau, in the year 1857, resolved itself to undertake the publication of good Targûm texts based upon MSS. But nothing definite came of this decision.† Within the last few years, however, a beginning has been made by individual scholars to meet this difficulty. Lagarde has given us a faithful copy of the consonant text of the celebrated Reuchlin codex of the year 1105, and has made the Bomberg text of the Hagiographa accessible to students. Berliner has made us acquainted with the Mâssôrâh to the Targûm Onkelos, and has given us a handy edition of the very rare Sabbioneta text of the Pentateuch. But this has reference only to the consonant text, which turns out to be more fixed than has generally been supposed. The greatest divergence in the MSS. and editions, however, lies in the vocalization. Here disorder and uncertainty reign supreme. Dr. Berliner, an authority on the subject, says ("Massorah," p. 124), "I am now quite certain that there is hardly a single line in the texts of our editions which is free from mistakes." A grammar of the Jewish Aramaic is as yet an impossibility; our Targûm lexicon is full of false forms. A scientific study of the Targûmîm can be made only upon the basis of a comparison of the best and oldest MSS. If we had only Tiberian MSS. at our disposal, it would be impossible to arrive at any certainty whatever. But the discovery of old Targûm MSS., punctuated according to the Babylonian system, has made such an attempt possible. These Babylonian texts do not differ so much among themselves. They are vocalized according to a uniform system. They represent the pronunciation as it was fixed by a school; the Tiberian, on the other hand, that of the common people. It will be seen from this that the Babylonian texts must form the basis of any future edition of the Targûmîm. This does not mean that the Babylonian is *a priori* to be given the prominence over the Tiberian. They are two distinct systems of punctuation; but it is only by means of the Babylonian that we can properly determine the Tiberian system.

But a good deal of preliminary work has to be done before we can think of re-editing any of the Targûmîm. The different MSS. (of which there are quite a number) must be examined, collated, and arranged in classes. The best must be selected, and the necessary variants noted.

* Mercier, in his "Decalogus Praeceptorum Divinorum, etc.," says expressly, "Item Targhum Onkeli in Decalogum.....recens punctis juxta analogiam grammaticam notatum per eundem." Buxtorf, in his edition of 1618, '19, says that he has edited the chaldaic text "ad antiquam veram et perpetuam priscae linguae Chaldaicae analogiam libris Esrae et Danielis pulcherrime prae-monstratam."

† See the history of different attempts in Berliner, "Targum Onkelos," II., p. 193 seq.; Lagarde, "Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen," 1887, No. 22, p. 861, seq. (Mittheil., II, p. 103).

The general plan of such a work has been sketched in the excellent little work of Professor Merx, of Heidelberg, "Bemerkungen über die Vocalisation der Targume" (Proceedings of Berlin Oriental Congress, Berlin, 1882, I., 142). With this end in view the same scholar has compiled the work before us, which forms part of the *Porta Linguarum Orientalium*. This little book deserves a hearty welcome from all interested in these studies. The Babylonian texts are here taken as the basis; the Tiberian variants from MSS. and old prints are given in notes at the bottom of the page. Professor Merx has confined himself, in these notes, to the most necessary references, though he has occasionally given us a grammatical or lexicographical excursus. The Babylonian superior punctuation is almost exclusively used, thus giving students a chance of becoming acquainted with this system. The book will have a double use. For the first time scholars will have the MS. evidence systematically presented; they will be able to determine the comparative worth of the two systems of vocalization. But the chrestomathy will also be of use to teachers who can safely put these texts into the hands of students. A small lexicon will make it possible for a beginner to find his way with very little help. It is safe to suppose that this new chrestomathy will give a fresh impetus to the study of these ancient texts which are so interesting to philologists as well as to students of the Biblical Word.

It is impossible in this brief notice to go into any detail. The lexicon is a very welcome addition, though a more extended use might have been made of some of the dialects—the Palmyrene for instance. As Professor Merx has occasionally gone out of his way to cite Ethiopic and Arabic, the Assyrian might have been brought in in several places to advantage. The science of Assyrian philology has surely advanced far enough to make its claims to recognition heard even by compilers of rabbinical grammars and lexicons.

It may be well to mention here that the library of Temple Emanu-El, in New York, possesses a MS. Maḥzôr, of the thirteenth century, which contains a number of the Haphtârôth in the Aramaic translation. The text is not that of our usual editions, but similar to the one found by Lagarde in an Ehfrurt Maḥzôr.* Upon some other occasion I hope to speak more fully about this Maḥzôr.

RICHARD GOTTHEIL,

Columbia College, N. Y.

* Symmicta I., 139. Cf. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, p. 120.

➤SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.◀

- LEVI, S. Vocabolario geroglifico-copto-ebraico. Vol.V. Turin: *Tip. Salussolid.*
..... 30fr.
- TYLER, THOMAS. The Hyksos. *Academy*, March 17, 1888.
- TOMKINS, HENRY GEORGE. The Route from Syria to Egypt. *Ibid.*, March 24,
1888.
- The Hyksos. *Ibid.*
- SAYCE, A. H. Letter from Egypt. *Ibid.*
- Babylonian Tablets from Upper Egypt. *Ibid.*, April 7, 1888.
- DOUGHTY, CHAS. M. Travels in Arabia Deserta. 2 vols. *Athenæum*, March 17,
1888.
- GOLDZIEHER, IGN. Arabische Beitræge zur Volksetymologie. *Ztschrft. f. Voelker-
psychologie* Band XVIII. Heft I.
- BAETHGEN, FRIED. Gottheil's Mâr(i) Eliâ of Sobhâ. *Deut. Litzng.*, March 3,
1888.
- MUELLER, H. Kritische Beiträge zur süd-arabischen Epigraphik. *Wiener
Ztschrft. f. k. Kunde des Morgenlandes.* II. 1.
- KRALL. Zwei koptische Verkaufsurkunden. *Ibid.*
- NOWACK, W. Bredenkamp's Der Prophet Jesaia. *Deut. Litzng.* March 24, 1888.
- RAGOZIN, Z. A. Chaldea, from the Earliest Times to the Rise of Assyria. Lon-
don: Unwin, 1888. 8vo, pp. 392. 5s.
- ZOTENBERG, HENRI. Histoire d'Alâ-al-dîn, ou la Lampe merveilleuse. Texte
arabe publié avec une notice sur quelques manuscrits des mille et une nuits.
Paris: *Maisonnewe*. 7f.
- SCHRADER, EBERHARD. Die keilinschriftliche babylonische Königliste. *Sitzungs-
berichte der königl. preuss. Akademie d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, Nov. 17,
1887.
- SACHAU, E. Alberuni's India. By T——n in *Lit. Centrblt.*, Feb. 18, 1888.
- DELITZSCH, FRIEDRICH. Critique of A. S. Smith's "Die Keilschrifttexte Asur-
banipals." *Ibid.*